DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 302 008 EC 211 805

AUTHOR Fulton-Burton, Louise
TITLE Analysis of Follow-Up Systems.
INSTITUTION Riverside County Dept. of Education, Calif.
PUB DATE 88
GRANT ETC-a.3.3-03
NOTE 145p.
AVAILABLE FROM Resources in Special Education (RiSE), 650 University Ave., Room 201, Sacramento, CA 95825.
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Data Collection; *Disabilities; Dropouts; *Followup Studies; Graduate Surveys; High Risk Students; *Measurement Techniques; Occupational Surveys; *Outcomes of Education; Program Development; Records (Forms); Secondary Education; *Special Education; *Systems Development

ABSTRACT

This manual provides a model for tracking the progress of special education and high-risk students who have completed secondary schooling. The manual includes a literature review, procedures for development of a followup system, a bibliography of over 200 followup materials, and a three-part followup instrument. Samples of followup instruments were analyzed, from school districts in California and across the nation. A three-part followup instrument was then designed, which included a teacher-completed School Records Form, a student-completed Baseline Form, and the Followup questionnaire. Content validity and reliability were examined through evaluation of current followup instruments, evaluation by an advisory panel, and field testing of the draft instrument and a modified instrument. Recommendations resulting from this study of followup systems focus on the need for: a systematic followup instrument and procedure, consistency across all related adult service agencies, field testing, ongoing review, effective interview methods, etc. Procedural guidelines provide step-by-step directions and sample forms and letters that can be used to implement a followup study. Critical tasks outlined in the guidelines include determining the scope of the data collection, identifying data sources, assessing resource needs and finalizing goals, preparing for followup data collection and collecting baseline data, and collecting followup data. (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED302008

Analysis of Follow-Up Systems

Education Transition Center

EC 211 905

Program, Curriculum, and Training Unit
California State Department of Education
Special Education Division
Sacramento, California

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Patricia Winget

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Analysis of Follow-Up Systems

Grant Number: a.3.3-03

Education Transition Center

Program, Curriculum, and Training Unit
California State Department of Education
Special Education Division
Sacramento, California
1988

This publication was funded by the Education Transition Center (ETC) under the direction of the Program, Curriculum, and Training Unit, Special Education Division, California State Department of Education.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, without permission in writing from the publisher. Copies of this publication are available from Resources in Special Education (RiSE), 650 University Avenue, Room 201, Sacramento 95825.

© Copyright 1988 by Education Transition Center.

Analysis of Follow-Up Systems

A Project Conducted By:

Dr. Louise Fulton-Burton
Project Consultant
Riverside County Office of Education

For:

The California State Department of Education
Education Transition Center
Dr. Patricia Kearly, Coordinator
Sacramento, California

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements..... i
Preface..... ii
Abstract.....iii

Introduction..... 1

Rationale..... 1

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE..... 1

A. Early Studies: 1919-1959
B. Recent Studies: 1959-1979
C. Current Studies: 1980-Present
D. Limitations of Follow-up Research
E. Need for Systematic Follow-up

REVIEW OF LOCAL, STATE AND NATIONAL FOLLOW-UP INSTRUMENTS.... 12

A. California School District Instruments
B. Regional Occupation Program Instruments
C. State/National Instruments

VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY..... 15

A. Instruments and Literature Review
B. Advisory Committee
C. Professional Input
E. Field Test #1
F. Field Test #2

FOLLOW-UP SURVEY FORMS..... 25

A. Baseline Information
B. School Record Information
C. Follow-Up Questionnaire

SURVEY DIRECTIONS AND SCRIPT 35

TIMELINE OF ACTIVITIES..... 41

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS..... 45

PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES..... 48

SOURCES OF SAMPLE INSTRUMENTS..... 77

REFERENCES..... 79

BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 87

APPENDICES.....104

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We wish to thank these people for their input and cooperation in this project:

Cal State Advisory Panel
Riverside Cross Agency Advisory Panel
Dr. Susan A. Stark, Assistant Superintendent, Division of Special Schools and Services, Riverside County Office of Education
Luis Heyden, Director, Division of Special Schools and Services, Riverside County Office of Education
John Grisafe, Oxnard Union High School District
Chris LeRoy, San Bernardino Unified School District
Dr. Charles Abrams, Decision Research
Joseph Pasanella, Santa Barbara Unified School District
Wayne Sailor, San Francisco State University
Mary Lantz, SELPA Regional Administrator
Fred Best, Pacific Management and Research Associates
Rita Marinoble, San Diego City Schools
Judy Hagenauer, San Diego City Schools

We also wish to thank the following individuals for their input and assistance in implementing our field tests:

Wade Coe, Riverside Unified School District
Ed Elliott, Moreno Valley Unified School District
Steve Hovey, Riverside County Office of Education
Tony Johnson, Riverside County Office of Education
Roy Savage, Riverside County Office of Education
Olivia Jaramillo, Riverside County Office of Education
Rita Bien-Hutchins, Riverside County Office of Education
Nancy DiCecco, Riverside County Office of Education
Diane Luxton, Riverside County Office of Education
Al Butler, Riverside County Office of Education
Mary Fowlie, Riverside County Office of Education
Andrea Kennedy, Valley Resource Center

This document would not exist without the diligence and patience of our secretarial staff:

Linda Bailey
Mary Ann Earl
Rita Patterson

October 1987

To Our Readers:

Questions of the long term outcomes of education are important ones for all who are associated with the schooling process. What happens to special education and other high risk students when school is finished? Are they working and learning? Are they in touch with adult agencies and support systems? Did schooling make a difference? What advice would they give us?

Educators and other service providers are becoming increasingly more aware of the need to track the progress of students during their early post school years. We realize that these efforts will provide data to use in program modification and will serve as a means to identify adult service strengths. Therefore, we know that any successful tracking system will need to collect compatible information from school to school, district to district, and across significant adult service agencies.

This manual is designed to serve as a model to use in tracking the progress of students who have completed secondary schooling. The manual includes a review of the literature, procedures for development of a recommended follow up system, an extensive bibliography on follow up and a three part follow up instrument.

It is hoped that the user of this manual will feel free to use the instrument as it is or in part, and that additional situation specific questions will be added when needed. The outcome most hoped for from these efforts is that there will be increased participation in systematic data collection on former special education and high risk students in California. If this happens, then the results can be used to improve the service delivery system in many significant ways.

No product of this magnitude is ever developed without the hard work and dedication of many people. Throughout the entire project period RCOE administration and staff have supported the activities of this grant in an exemplary manner. Rebecca Towner-Harmer and Robin Faigin worked tirelessly during the summer and fall of 1987 to insure that every detail was completed in a high quality fashion. Tom Wojciehowski provided strong leadership in the organization of the project and strengthened the research portion of the final project. Bonnie Russell was resourceful and supportive, many times without sufficient lead time. Andy Schultz, Mary Sutton and graduate students at CSU-San Bernardino assisted in the collection and analysis of data during the initial field test. And there were many others - advisory board members, experienced colleagues throughout California and the nation, and numerous unnamed professionals who were asked to provide information and from whom we borrowed many ideas, strategies and methods of information retreival.

All of this help came in the spirit of true collaboration and for this we are deeply grateful.

L.F.B.

ABSTRACT

The California State Department of Education specifies follow-up of special education and high-risk graduates/leavers as one of the four major components of successful transition to adult quality of life and employment in the community. The impending mandate for follow-up two years after leaving California schools will benefit the school districts that participate by producing data that will have significant implications about school curricula and teaching methods as they relate to future quality of life for all "at-risk" school leavers. To influence change in school classrooms and vocational transition programs an analysis of results relating to these factors is needed. Currently the majority of school systems provide data systems that are inconsistent or completed infrequently and produce inaccurate, sketchy results.

This system developing follow-up instruments, field testing, and reporting results is done collaboratively between the Riverside County Office of Education and California State University-San Bernardino. This model provides the reader with a rationale for the survey and reviews previous available literature on follow-up studies conducted as early as 1919 and as recently as 1986. The limitations of follow-up research and the need for systematic procedures to follow-up school leavers is addressed.

Also included in this project is an extensive review of other follow-up instruments and retrieval efforts. The areas of review cover state-wide efforts of special education and other at-risk programs Regional Occupational Program (ROP) endeavors, and a variety of research studies conducted in other states throughout the nation. The procedures and timelines followed during the project are outlined specifically.

Validity and reliability of these methods of data retrieval are discussed examining previous literature that identifies follow-up systems and instruments which were developed and field tested in California and the nation. The discussion of the role of the Riverside Cross Agency Advisory Panel that reviewed and modified the final recommendations and instruments is provided. The methods of achieving professional input from school and agency administrators input and other field reviewers is discussed. Results of two field tests which included information gathered from nearly 200 interviewees across a variety of sample populations, and methods of interview are analyzed and reported.

Three data collection instruments were developed and recommended. A teacher-completed School Records Form, a student-completed Baseline Form and the Follow-up questionnaire. The first two forms are completed before the student leaves school. The post-

school Follow up Interview Form comes complete with directions and a script and the information is collected at yearly intervals. Recommendations from this study include the need for a systematic follow-up procedure and data gathering instrument as well as the need for consistency across agencies and regions, and the need for a more thorough district-wide field test over a three year period. The final draft of the instrument is provided, and questions can be added, given population and geographic considerations. When deciding on a method for interviews, it is suggested that the telephone is used whenever possible to reduce cost, staff and travel time. The personal interview can be used when surveying school leavers with severe challenges or special communication needs. Interpretive services are also a necessary consideration. The most critical issue faced to date is the need for careful selection and training of the interviewers themselves because of the importance of recording pertinent information using a systematic method.

This study is meant as a resource for future follow-up research and for local use by school district and adult service provider agencies.

The project does have limitations. Results of the field tests should be interpreted with caution due to time constraints of the project. Further field tests should be conducted to identify needed changes and additions. The following limitations have been identified by project staff.

The time of the year resulted in both field tests being conducted in summer, thus school staff were difficult to contact. This limited the amount of baseline information gained, and the number of administrators responding to requests for information were low.

Due to time constraints, a large proportion of the sample population for the second field test was in urban areas, no regular education comparison group was used, the study was conducted one time rather than over a two or three year period, the field test was limited to groups of 75 and 90, and there was no test/retest on the sample population using the same instrument.

The range of time out of school for former students included in the field tests varied between two to five years.

INTRODUCTION

The California State Department of Education specifies follow-up as one of four major components of a successful transition program (California State Department of Education, Definition of Transition, 1-7-87). Accordingly, educational systems in the State of California will be responsible for following the movement of each exceptional needs student for two years after leaving school. Follow-up procedures will benefit California educational systems by producing outcome oriented data with significant implications for improving the quality of life for all "at risk" school leavers. A major first step in the development of a follow-up system which can be recommended to the California Educational Transition Center, is to review the literature on post school follow-up. The review of the literature is reported in the following components: Rationale, Review of Early Studies, Studies between 1960 and 1979 and Current Studies.

RATIONALE

Between 250,000 and 300,000 special education students leave educational programs yearly (Will, 1983), yet little is known about the results of schooling for most of these former students. There is a growing concern over the net benefits of all educational programs from policy makers who allocate funds, to parents, educators and rehabilitation professionals and those who worry about the future of students with handicaps (Hasazi, Gordon, and Roe, 1985; Okolo & Sitlington, 1986; Rusch & Phelps, 1987; & Wehman, Hill, Hill, Brooke, Pendleton & Brill, Brown, Shiraga, Ford, Nisbet, Van De Venter, Sweet, York & Luanis, 1983). According to Mithaug, Horiuchi & Fanning (1985), follow-up studies on the status and experiences of program graduates provide an attractive means for ongoing evaluation of special education programs. Without specific information about student outcomes, it will continue to be difficult to evaluate program effectiveness and to form research-based recommendations regarding program change needs.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

EARLY STUDIES (1919-1959)

The social, emotional and vocational adjustments of former special education students have been a subject of interest for more than 50 years. Most early follow-up studies have focused on students with mild or moderate mental retardation and emphasize vocational outcomes. The first follow-up studies were reported in 1919. Matthews (1919) investigated the status of 100 men who had been discharged from the Massachusetts School for the Feebleminded for 1 to 5 years. The author attempted to identify relationships between mental age, chronological age and occupational variables and concluded that wage earnings were more likely to

be related to chronological age than mental age. That same year (1919) Fernald interviewed 646 mildly and moderately retarded adults 2 to 25 years after leaving a residential school and determined that with increased supervision by case workers mentally retarded persons could function successfully outside of institutions. During the mid-1930's follow-up studies became more popular. In 1933, Fairbanks compared non-mentally retarded and mentally retarded former students on employment dimensions and found few differences. In a later study, Kennedy (1948) reported similar findings. In another comparison study, Baller (1936), in a study of the social adjustment of 196, found former students with mental retardation to be employed at a rate of 30 percent less than the non-handicapped sample population. On the other hand, Lord (1933) studied 230 individuals who had attended Massachusetts special education classes and reported only 3.9 percent to be vocationally unsuccessful. He further reported 80 percent as "spending their time profitably" and 48.7 percent of the sample population as "making good social adjustment in the community. Follow-up studies investigating employment outcomes of former special education students who had participated in vocational training programs were reported by Hollman (1933) and Keys and Nathan (1932). In a San Francisco study, Keys and Nathan examined the records of over 2,500 former special education students who had received vocational training and found that most of the former students were employed as unskilled laborers. Hollman (1933) described the results of a two year study comparing the current employment situation of 314 former special education students with 413 regular education students. The author reported that 25 percent of the special education students who had participated in school vocational training programs were employed.

During the 1940s, follow-up studies continued to emphasize the employment and community adjustment of adults with mild to moderate mental retardation and attempts were made to correlate success with treatment, training or IQ. Former trade school trainees were studied by Abel (1940) and McIntosch (1949). The current employment status of 64 mildly and moderately retarded females who had attended a trade school was studied by Abel. The author concluded that IQ, personality and home stability affected job success. McIntosch examined the employment history of over 1000 former trade school students with mild or moderate retardation and determined that motivation and emotional stability appear to influence salary. Other authors investigated the adjustment and employment of former residents of institutions (Kinder, Chase & Buck, 1941; Little & Johnson, 1946). Kinder et al. studied the social adjustment of females who had been residents of a state mental institution and a state correctional facility. Eight years after their discharge those who had been in the mental institution were reported to have made more successful community adjustment than the comparison group from the correctional institution. Little and Johnson followed 113 mildly retarded adults one to three years after leaving a state mental institution and compared community adjustment variables separately two separate populations.

Several follow-up studies conducted during the 1940s examined the relationships between IQ and other factors including employment success (Coakley, 1945; Hegge, 1944) promotion in the army (Haskell, 1943) and community adjustment (Whitcomb, 1945). In each case the subjects were adults with mild to moderate mental retardation and in no case was a direct relationship between IQ and employment or adjustment reported.

Studies examining the past school employment status of former special education students during the 1950's were conducted with adults who had been out of school from one to several years. Results of these studies evidenced a wide range of employment success ranging from 10 percent to 92 percent for the population studies. All studies reported results of a single investigation, thus none were longitudinal, and the sample of most studies included former students of one school or district. Delf and Lorenz (1953) studied 66 students with an IQ of below 50 who were at one time enrolled in special education classes in St. Paul, Minnesota to determine their occupational status as well as social adjustment, personal habits and recreational activities. As a result of personal interviews the authors reported that 62 percent were still living at home, 38 percent were in institutions, and that most were well accepted in their neighborhood. Favorite leisure activities were non-participatory ones (TV or radio), and 80 percent were reported to have adequate self help skills. Ten of the 66 former students had been gainfully employed but few were mobile beyond their immediate neighborhood. Bobroff (1956) conducted personal interviews with 121 former special education students of Detroit Public Schools to determine their economic adjustment. Most of the subjects had been out of school for 12 years. He reported approximately 92 percent as employed, 16 percent in skilled, 5 percent in service and 8 percent in clerical occupations.

In a study of 49 adults with mental retardation who had left Lincoln and Omaha, Nebraska schools 6 to 10 years ago, Carraker (1957) reported 86 percent to be employed, with approximately 75 percent in unskilled work, 8 percent in semiskilled and 4 percent in skilled work. Mullen (1952) reported on the findings of a follow-up study of 208 former mildly handicapped students who had participated in the Chicago public schools special education programs and concluded that the former students were working successfully in a wide range of jobs.

Other follow-up studies conducted during the 1950s report on the employment status of school completers outside of the United States. Collmann and Newlyn (1956) examined the status of 223 former special education students in England who had been out of school for 1 to 4 years and concluded that job success depended on skill training and placement with an understanding employer. Ferguson and Kerr (1955) followed 209 mildly and moderately retarded girls six years after they had completed special educations program in Scotland and reported that a high percentage were employed. In a later study by the same authors (1985) similar results were reported. Cassidy & Phelps (1955) and Saenger (1957) conducted follow-up studies on state-wide samples. Cassidy and Phelps studied graduates of 19 special education programs in

Ohio. The sample included 268 adults with mild mental retardation who had been out of school for 3 to 4 years. They found an employment rate of 87 percent with 34 percent in unskilled, 30 percent in semiskilled, 2 percent in skilled, 20 percent in service and 8 percent in clerical jobs. Saenger (1957) studied the lifestyles of a sample of 520 adults with moderate retardation who attended classes in New York between 1929 and 1956 and found that 66 percent were living in the community and most could dress and feed themselves. The author further reported that 23 percent were gainfully employed (mostly part-time), 33 percent traveled in the larger community and 73 percent were non-competitively employed in a post-school habilitation program.

RECENT STUDIES (1960-1979)

Prior to the inclusion of a significant number of moderately and severely handicapped students into the school system, a large number of studies on the vocational outcomes of schooling were conducted. Studies which preceded the passage of PL 94-142 were usually confined to a single city or school district, were conducted at a single point in time, and examined the vocational and adjustment situation of former students who had left school across varying numbers of years (Brolin, 1972; Chafflin, Spellman, Regan and Davidson, 1971; Edgerton and Bercovici, 1976; Dinger, 1961; Gozali, 1972; Howe, 1967; Kennedy, 1967; Mahoney, 1976; McFall, 1966; Peterson and Smith, 1960; Powers and Lewis, 1976; Reich, 1973; Stanfield, 1973; Titus and Travis, 1973).

Several of these studies attempted to examine the relationship between school programs and adult adjustment. Brolin (1972), in a study of the efficacy of rehabilitation services for individuals with mental retardation, utilized a follow-up questionnaire to collect data from 1,933 former diagnostic center clients in Madison, Wisconsin. Results supported the value of rehabilitation services for males (more than females) and evidenced that 40 percent of the clients were not reaching their vocational potential. The author concluded that these results indicate a need for improving rehabilitation efforts. Peterson and Smith (1960) report on personal interviews conducted on 45 former special education students and 45 non-handicapped students in Cedar Rapids, Iowa to draw conclusions regarding the adjustment of adults with mental retardation. The deficiencies identified within the sample population of mentally retarded subjects included inability to find jobs upon school leaving, higher rates of unemployment, frequent job changes, lack of use of adult assistance agencies, substandard residences, little use of recreational facilities, numerous encounters with the law and frequent credit abuse.

The study also revealed equivalencies among the two comparison groups in several areas of adult adjustment including job satisfaction, frequency of application for unemployment compensation, family size and participation in voting. The authors concluded that training for

community membership was needed, and provided a list of recommendations for consideration with school programming at the senior high school level.

Based on findings and recommendations of the Peterson and Smith study, Dinger (1961) conducted unannounced home visitations with a sample of 100 former special education students in Altoona, Pennsylvania. Dinger's intent was to determine which positive adjustments were being made by the former special education students in order to identify areas of need for educators. During the visitations he observed and discussed conditions related to educational, military, occupational, marital, financial, community and leisure activities and asked for the subjects' opinions on future curricula. The author concluded that 85 percent were entirely self supporting, 75 percent did not belong to any socialization team, club, or activity, 47 percent had experienced post school educational training, 55 percent were married, and sixty five of the age-eligible males had served in the armed forces. Curricular suggestions made by the subjects were in the areas of credit buying, saving, loans, insurance and budgeting.

Strickland and Arrell (1967) analyzed the employment history of 1,405 adults who had participated in a Texas school work program for educable mentally retarded students to determine whether or not the youths had found employment in the jobs for which they had been trained. The co-operative program between the Texas Division of Vocational Rehabilitation and the local school district's special education department existed for the purpose of providing classroom instruction and on-the-job training for special education students aged 16 and above. Findings indicated that there was a strong relationship between job training and employment. Eighty percent of the subjects had been placed in jobs for which they had been trained, jobs were secured in occupational areas which offered future employment and 10 percent of the students had needed only counseling and direct placement to become productive. The authors concluded that it is possible to determine which jobs can be performed by youth with mental retardation and how best to secure jobs in those vocational areas.

The economic self-sufficiency of former students has been the subject of much investigation. A study by Gozali (1972) followed 56 former students with mild mental retardation who had participated in a school work study program. According to Gozali, 25 percent were employed, 45 percent were married and domestically self-sufficient and 55 percent were living with their parents and were single. The author reported that the average income for the group was below the poverty level. Titus and Travis (1973) further established the low economical self-sufficiency of former students who had participated in a special education program for students with mild mental retardation. Their findings evidenced that former students were earning $1.40 to $3.85 per hour. The occurrence of low earnings is further supported by the follow-up studies done by Dinger (1961) and Peterson and Smith (1960). In an attempt to examine

the relationship between general poor economic conditions and employment rates for adults with mild mental retardation, Halpern (1973) conducted personal interviews with those terminated from work experience programs in 14 school districts in Oregon. Interviews were conducted over a two year period during which great variances in general economic condition occurred. While the author cautioned against regarding the evidence as conclusive, his results do indicate that high community unemployment rates will adversely effect new employment opportunities but do not necessarily jeapardize currently employed workers with mental retardation. Halpern further proposed that workers with mental retardation who have participated in well structured vocational programs have a good chance of finding a job even when there is general unemployment. These results are supported by Dinger (1973) who examined the relationship between school programs and post school employment of 183 former students with mild mental retardation.

Stanfield (1973) conducted a follow-up study among a sample of 120 of the 1968-1970 special education graduates of a school district in Los Angeles. Parents or guardians of former students with moderate retardation were interviewed to assess the quality of community life students experienced. The author reported that 94 percent were living at home, with only one living independently. Forty-eight percent were in structured workshop programs, with 80 percent earning under $10.00 per week. No graduate was self-supporting, however, three were working in unsheltered settings. Almost all were caring for their personal needs, 60 percent could move about in their immediate neighborhood and most spent the majority of the day engaged in passive, solitary activities. Stanfield noted that the model of services for adults with retardation assumes that there will be an ongoing and permanent parent-child relationship. In another study, Boyce and Elzey (1978) contacted 98 former special education students in San Francisco. The sample was divided between those who did and did not receive vocational training. Following graduation, those who had participated in the vocational training program achieved employment at a greater rate and were employed at higher levels than the non-vocational program group.

Research to identify significant academic variables and outcomes has attempted to draw conclusions by studying the post school adjustment status of former special education students with specific disabilities. Several authors during the 1970s devoted their follow-up research efforts towards the evaluation of specific academic, perceptual and communication program outcomes. Follow-up studies of children identified as having speech and communication disorders were conducted by Garvey and Gordon, (1973), Griffiths, (1969), Hall and Tomblin (1978) and Wesner (1972), whereas Eves and Crichtons (1945) followed children previously diagnosed as having minimal brain dysfunction. Radar, Shapiro, Hisuaro, and Rodin (1978) conducted follow-up studies on 58 adults with epileptic disorders over a two year competitive employment placement period and reported a 76 percent employment rate. Cook (1976) followed 98 adults with visual handicaps who completed a school program

within the past 3 to 13 years. The study focused on a variety of community and vocational adjustment factors and was intended to provide feedback on the program for the visually handicapped in Wisconsin. Olansky & Beach (1975) and Vogel (1975) interviewed 164 former students of a South Dakota Crippled Children's Hospital and school and reported that 45 percent were employed. Twenty-four percent were attending school or receiving further training and 31 percent were non-productive and dependent.

Follow-up studies to examine the employment status of former special education students who had been labeled mildly handicapped continued to dominate the literature during the 1970s. Tobias (1970) studied the records of 1,836 former students in New York and found that 60 percent of the males and 30 percent of the females were employed. Shonnyfelt (1974) interviewed 94 former students with mild mental retardation one to five years after leaving an occupational school and reported that 79 percent were employed. Richardson and Krieger (1976) conducted interviews with 144 former Easter Seal - Goodwill Industries clients who had been placed in competitive employment over a two year period. At the time of the second interview 50 percent of the clients were maintaining full time employment. A study conducted by Skaabrevik (1971) in Norway examined the employment status of 122 former students with mild retardation and reported that 73 percent of the graduates were employed. Results of this study were used to justify additional government funds to support employment training and community living situations.

CURRENT STUDIES (1980-Present)

Although the greatest number of follow-up studies were conducted during the 1960s and 1970s and prior to the inclusion of many moderately and severely handicapped students in public school programs (Hasazi et al., 1985), concern over the outcome of schooling has prompted additional investigations during the current decade. Follow-up studies have been conducted in samples representative of a wide range of disability groups. Edgar and Levine (1986) interviewed parents of 1,292 former special education students from 15 school districts in Washington state. Telephone interviews were used to gather information on students from all disability groups relative to their employment, current living and education status and their opinions of the effectiveness of their former school program. A control group of non-handicapped students was also studied. Results indicated that 58 percent of the total sample were employed with 65 percent of the learning disabled and behavior disordered, 39 percent of the severely handicapped, and 43 percent of the mildly mentally retarded group employed.

Horiuchi (1983) conducted a state wide study to gather information on the employment status of students who completed special education programs in 1978 and 1979 in Colorado. Personal interviews were

conducted with 234 individuals with a wide range of handicapping conditions. His findings suggest that the former students had made good community adjustment and that nearly 70 percent were working at least part-time, but that many were earning at marginal levels. The author also reported that most of the respondents were living at home with their parents and that many expressed a desire for more social participation.

In 1984, Hawkins conducted telephone interview with 92 former special education students in Montgomery County, Maryland to gather data on additional education, employment status and living situation as well as information on the former students opinion of the school program. The author reported that 47 percent of the graduates were working and attending school and that 80 percent were living at home with their parents one year after completing school. Thirty-six employers who were also interviewed reported that they were satisfied with the work of the former students. In a study by Gill (1984), parents of 194 former special education students were asked to complete questionnaires regarding their child's handicapping condition while in school, as well the employment history and post-school educational experiences. The author concluded that 50 percent of the group had been employed since leaving school, 23 percent had not worked within the past three years and 80 percent had not experienced any post school education.

Studies to examine the outcome of school among students with mild handicapping conditions continue to be reported. An investigation was conducted among 462 former special education students from nine school district in Vermont (Hasazi, Gordon and Roe, 1985) to examine their employment status. These students had exited school between 1979 and 1983 and had been previously classified as mildly handicapped, including learning disabilities, emotional disturbance and mild mental retardation. Interviews were conducted with the 301 former students, or a knowledgeable informant, to gain information on their employment and training history and use of social services. Demographic data relating to school programs were taken from school records. The authors reported that 55 percent of the former students were employed in paying jobs. Sixty percent of those who had graduated were working as opposed to 51 percent of those who had dropped out before completing school. In addition, 84 percent of the employed group had found jobs through self, family or friend networks. Following an analysis of the relationship between school training and current employment status, the authors concluded that students in vocational programs were more likely to be employed and that work experiences in paid or summer jobs were positively related to employment outcome.

Another follow-up study of former students who were classified as mildly handicapped was conducted by Craine (1980) who examined occupational records and conducted telephone interviews with 130 educable mentally retarded school completers of a St. Louis Special School district. Results indicated that 68 percent of the respondents were working and

that the majority were earning a minimum of $7,000 yearly. In 1983, Cook investigated the economic and vocational adjustment status of 105 former vocational rehabilitation clients. Using the data, Cook developed three case study vignettes exemplifying client types and drawing a parallel between client evaluation and program outcome.

Brown, Shiraga, Ford, Nisbet, Van Deventer, Sweet, York and Loomis (1983) and Wehman, Kregel and Seyfarth (1985) report follow-up studies with former students who when they were in school were labeled as moderate to severely handicapped. Brown et al. studied the status of graduates with severe disabilities of the Madison Public Schools between 1971 and 1978 and again in 1979-1982. Their findings revealed significant differences between the employment successes of two sample populations with 1 of 53 of the first group and 27 of 38 of the second group employed. The authors attributed the employment success of the second group primarily to the changes in school curriculum toward community-based instructional strategies in the school.

Wehman et al. conducted interviews between 1978 and 1983 with 300 parents of students in Virginia who had completed school programs for students with moderate, severe or profound retardation. The sample was distributed across four locations including rural and urban settings. Twenty-five questions on the 60 item survey instrument were related to employment status, the other questions addressed demographic information and adjustment factors which effect employment. Results indicated that a total of 125 persons were experiencing some kind of employment, with 12 percent of persons with moderate and severe mental retardation in competitive employment.

Longitudinal studies are beginning to emerge. Hill, Hill, Wehman, Bourks, Pendleton and Britt (1985) examined the work status of a group of mentally retarded individuals over six years. The purpose of the study was to examine variables which influence job retention beyond six months. The authors reported significant differences in reading levels, types of adult employment and training program attended and drew conclusions regarding implications for vocational training.

Two studies which provide data on the employment and adjustment situation of former special students who learn and live in rural areas have emerged. Fardig, Algozzini, Schwartz, Hensel and Westling (1985) focused their efforts on the post school adjustment of 113 former students with mild handicaps who live in rural areas. Analysis of demographic employment data and interviews led the authors to conclude that the former students were employed an average of 50 percent of the time with fifty students earning minimum wage or above. An analysis of the relationship between the former students' employment status and the school training program revealed a significant relationship between occupational status and years of schooling and certain academic variables. In another rural follow-up study Shalock, Wolzen, Ross, Elliott, Werble and Peterson (1986) examined the employment and

community adjustment status of 108 mentally handicapped former students in rural Nebraska. Findings revealed that 66 percent of the school completers were employed in competitive situations and 22 percent were living independently.

LIMITATIONS OF FOLLOW-UP RESEARCH

Follow-up studies have been used to examine the post school adjustment of individuals with disabilities since the mid 1930s, yet limitations in the scope and focus of the studies persist. A major problem is the lack of longitudinal data to use in both describing the product and in comparing the progress of former students over time. Almost all studies describe information collected at one point in time at varying intervals since school leaving. Findings of a one shot study should be interpreted with caution and there is reason to believe that considerable time is required for high-risk students to fully achieve maximum community adjustment. Cobb (1972) suggested that the passage of time is likely to increase adjustment and stability. In a discussion of transition needs Okolo and Sitlington (1986) further underscored the necessity of short term as well as longitudinal research in order to identify the relationship between job related academic and vocational training and subsequent community adjustment. Research such as that done by Edgerton (1967) and Edgerton and Bercovici (1976) on a Southern California post institutionalized population and recent studies by Brown, Rogan, Shiraga, Albright, Kessler, Bryson, Van Deventer and Loomis (1987) and Edgar and Levine (1987) provide examples of a quantative data base which is beginning to emerge. Another frequently reported limitation of the current data base on follow-up relates to the description of the target population. Mithaug and Horiuchi (1983) noted that 90 percent of the literature reports follow-up on former students with mental retardation, mostly mild learning problems. There are significant voids in follow-up information on former students with communication, physical, behavioral, neurological or other health disorders and even academic difficulties. For students previously diagnosed as learning disabled follow-up has usually emphasized reading (Fafard and Haubrich, 1981; White, Alley, Deshler, Schumaker, Warner and Clark, 1982; and Hasazi, et al. 1985). Horn, O'Donnell and Vitulano (1983), in a review of long term follow-up for persons with learning disabilities, described methodological inadequacies of existing studies which should be considered in implementing studies, including age of former student at the time of follow-up, need for control groups, subject attrition, definition of 'learning disability' and outcome variables. Analysis of 24 follow-up studies in their report revealed that 17 of the studies measured achievement in basic skills, 10 included measures of vocational status and 5 studies reported emotional/behavioral functioning at the time of follow-up. Other limitations in the type of information gathered are reported by Mithaug et al. (1985) and Okolo et al. (1986) who noted that most studies are limited to or emphasize vocational outcome. While employment is an important component of community adjustment,

other information may be equally critical to making judgements about success. For example, since social and behavioral training comprise the major program for a significant number of students in special education, it appears reasonable to include the gathering of such data for follow up.

Another frequently mentioned problem with follow-up research is the variation in community type. Most studies according to Fardig, Algozzini, Schwartz, Hensel and Westling (1985) are conducted in urban areas, yet it is widely accepted that non-urban graduates experience quite different obstacles and employment opportunities than those who live in metropolitan areas. As 67 percent of all school districts are located in rural areas (Sher, 1978) it seems reasonable to assume that a critical follow-up research need is not being met.

Other limitations include the need for control groups as a suggested means to make comparisons between those who did and did not receive services (Brolin, 1972), use of a control group of non-handicapped individuals, and variations in what is defined as successful vocational adjustment (Butler and Browning, 1970 and Okolo and Sitlington, 1986). Further typical studies include graduates from only a few schools or districts, thus restricting generalization of findings (Chaffin, Spellman, Regan and Davidson, 1971; Dinger, 1961; Howe, 1967; Mahoney, 1976; McFall, 1966; Peterson and Smith, 1960; Reich, 1973 and Stanfield, 1973). Finally it has been suggested that much of the data gathered relates to the performance of former students whereas it would be equally important to gather data as to whether or not graduates feel the school program prepared them for the future.

NEED FOR SYSTEMATIC FOLLOW-UP

Although a wide variety of follow-up studies have been developed for individuals with disabilities over the last fifty years, essential diversity of the studies undermines efforts to draw reliable conclusions from the data. The studies have been sporadic, drawn from small bases, and limited in scope by the narrow, specific needs of the author(s) of each instrument. For example, social employment development teams, rehabilitation workers, school managers, and university researchers are not asking the same questions. The result is a wealth of data that has no center, that allows few generalizations, and fails to promote the correlation and coordination of information that schools and other special agencies need to collaborate their efforts to increase employment opportunities for individuals with handicaps. The lack of longitudinal data in follow-up studies, the narrow and homogenous nature of each target special population, the failure, in many studies, to employ control groups, and the diverse communities represented in various studies, all lead to the conclusion that an attempt to standardize follow-up procedures must be made. A systematic procedure

that accurately documents the employment successes and failures of the whole gamut of special populations is the only way to establish the fluency necessary for school and community services to seriously address transition. We need a common language.

REVIEW OF LOCAL, STATE AND NATIONAL FOLLOW-UP INSTRUMENTS

A random sample of 132 California school programs including 30 ROPs, 46 school districts, 54 county offices of education and 2 private agencies were contacted concerning their use of follow-up procedures. The districts and agencies were distributed among rural, urban and suburban settings and served enrollments varying between 100 to 650,000 students. Twelve state/national sources were also contacted. Most of these represented research studies through major universities which were conducted by leaders in the field of special education.

Each school/agency in the sample received a cover letter which explained the nature of the Riverside research project and a stamped self addressed post card. Respondents were asked to identify whether or not a follow-up procedure was currently being used and to indicate whether they did or did not have information we could use. The post card request reduced the need for further contacts and resulted in a 58 percent return rate. Respondents included 28 district/agencies and 12 state/national sources who sent follow-up instruments and/or information and 48 district/agencies that responded they had no information to share.

Following the request for information, samples of instruments used by school districts in California and across the nation were examined for similarities and differences through an instrument review form (See Appendix 3). Analysis of the instruments revealed variations in content, population studied and method of data collection. Once reviewed, instruments were separated into three groups for further study: follow-up systems used by school districts in California, those used by Regional Occupational Programs (ROP) and systems used for state or regional studies.

CALIFORNIA SCHOOL DISTRICT INSTRUMENTS

Examples of follow-up systems provided by the sample population of California school districts revealed a broader range in content than those in the ROP and national/regional groups. Appendix 3 provides a graphic display of the major content among the several sample district/school instruments which were examined. Most systems reported gathering data on former students' perceptions of their school program by asking questions such as "Which courses do you wish you had taken?" "How useful was your math course to prepare you for the future?" or "Did your vocational training course help prepare you for a job?" In the narrative

either accompanying the survey instrument or in the final report of the survey results, almost all districts/agencies noted that the intent of the study was to measure program effectiveness. Most of the examined instruments track all or a random sample of all graduates and school leavers, usually including special needs and other at-risk in the sample, however, several agencies have developed specific follow-up procedures for special education students. The most frequent method for collecting data is mailout, with a second mailout and an eventual telephone follow up for non-respondents. School districts report a high return rate ranging from 60 percent (Long Beach Unified) to 90 percent (Grossmont Union High School). The number of students in the sample varies between 335 and 1,655, with the exception of Los Angeles Unified, which uses a senior exit interview not a post-school follow up. Content of the follow-up studies always includes questions related to current employment status and most instruments solicit information about further education experiences since leaving school. Other typical questions include those relating to recreation/leisure, use of support agencies, current living situation and transportation usage. Most programs report that a systematic computerized program is used to store and retrieve information for further comparison.

REGIONAL OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAM INSTRUMENTS

Survey instruments provided by ROP programs were less comprehensive with emphasis on ROP program evaluation and current employment status. Appendix 3 provides a graphic display of the content and method used in the sample ROP programs. Several examples provide excellent models to use in establishing baseline information with students prior to school completion to enhance student tracking. Participation in continuing education is also included as a survey item in several of the examples, and some request information on military status. In general the instruments are brief, usually one to two pages, and all have either a preliminary contact by mail with a second mail out for non-respondents or a telephone contact format. Response rates were exceptionally high ranging from 73 percent (Fresno ROP) to 100 percent (Tri-County ROP). Several of the forms included questions from the State of California VEA-45A student follow-up accountability form, and all programs report computer coding and storage of results.

STATE/NATIONAL INSTRUMENTS

Sample instruments used in twelve state or regional follow-up studies were examined for consistency in content and method of data collection. Appendix 3 provides an analysis of instruments in this group. The studies done in Ohio , Michigan , and Florida concentrate on high school graduates, with no specific reference to former special

education or at risk students. Content of reported studies in California, is similar, with emphasis on post school, vocational, educational, marital and living status.

The instrument provided by DECISION RESEARCH is similar to these instruments in that it also makes no specific reference to special education or at-risk students. This instrument provide an example of a study performed by a private research agency in collaboration with school districts. Under their system called TRACE FOLLOW-UP SERVICES, this agency has conducted post school follow-up research for 12 years in 700 schools and districts. The materials were carefully examined for content consistency and procedure innovations. The TRACE instrument measures a relationship between high school education and post high school education and employment outcomes. In each of its studies, DECISION RESEARCH conducts two mailout attempts and tracks non-respondents by phone, achieving a response rate of 85 percent.

Pacific Management and Research Associates (PMRA) has developed an instrument being used by the California Occupational Information Coordinating Committee (COICC). This instrument provides data on goals, education and employment of former vocational students and a match between training and job requirements. Information on employment status of former students is coded and entered into an IBM compatible form for use across a variety of agencies.

Other instruments examined in the State/Regional Group are used wi former Special Education students. The Pennsylvania study addresses a deaf population, the California Study on a WorkAbilty population and the Maine , Wisconsin, and Virginia studies done with severely and moderately handicapped students. The other studies, Washington, Vermont and Colorado include a group of former special education students with a wide variety of handicapping conditions.

Most state and regional studies collect follow-up information by telephone or face-to-face interviews by trained interviewers. Interval time between school completion and follow-up contact varies from one to five years. Content almost always includes a section on the relevancy between school courses and post-school life as well as vocational and educational experiences. Several instruments solicit information on transportation, independent living, quality of life and adult services utilized. Most instruments are several pages in length, ranging from five to eleven pages. Two studies report use of a local or national comparison group in analyzing results (DECISION RESEARCH and Washington) and all appear to utilize a computer-base for storage and analysis of data.

VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

Content validity and reliability for this instrument, as defined by Gay (1987) was examined in several ways. First, grant project staff studied and evaluated current follow-up literature instruments and studies being used in California and nationwide. Second, an advisory panel was formed to evaluate the process, product and progress of the grant. Third, professionals who are significant in the transition process for students who are at-risk or in special education programs, reviewed drafts of the follow-up instrument and made recommendations. Next, the first draft of the instrument was field tested. Based on the information gained from the initial test, three more drafts of the instrument were produced the last of which was field tested. The combination of these quality examinations produced a fifth and final draft and served to assure a quality product.

INSTRUMENTS AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Initially, the Wehman et al. (1985), the Hasazi et al. (1982), the Mithaug et al. (1983), and the Brown et al., follow-up studies were reviewed by project staff (L. Burton and T. Wojciehowski) after personal contact was made with each senior author Riverside project staff then requested information from 130 agencies including ROPs, school district, and county offices of education throughout California and received a total of twenty-eight instruments. In addition, eleven current university affiliate studies were sent from sources throughout the Unites States. All thirty-nine of these follow-up studies and instruments were reviewed and evaluated for usability and appropriateness using an evaluation form generated by project staff (see Appendix 8).

Another evaluation form was created to review current and earlier related literature for relevance, population studied, content areas and other information, (see Appendix 9). Project staff collected, studied and referenced 99 pieces of literature which provided valuable information in the development of the follow-up instrument. In addition to studies of follow-up instruments and literature the content of this instrument was validated by continuous review and input from professionals in closely related fields.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

An eleven member advisory panel was formed to serve as an evaluation team to examine the process, product and progress of the grant project. The members of the panel represented expertise and experience in various levels of educational, social service and personal involvement with youth at risk and in special education programs. Members included a parent, an employer, a rehabilitation counselor, a habilitation counselor, a regional center caseworker,a director of mental health

services, a principal of a continuation high school, a principal of special education programs, a university professor of special education, a teacher of special education students and a vocational education resource teacher (See Appendix 2). The panel members were asked to attend three meetings during which they would review the progress of the grant.

The objectives of the first meeting were to define the roles of the Panel members and to gather their input and suggestions for improvements of the first draft of the follow-up instrument. The second meeting included additional feedback on the revised draft of the instrument as well as recommendations for methods and implementation of the field test. The purpose of the third meeting was to review the field test results and the first drafts of the follow-up procedure guide. Members were surveyed as to their evaluation of the overall grant organization and process at each meeting.

PROFESSIONAL INPUT

During the course of this project two panels of professionals were formed to review, evaluate and give recommendations on the applicability of the instrument, process of the grant methods and procedures as well as the overall project effectiveness. The first panel of experts, formed in April 1987 was composed of twenty individuals representative of parents/parent groups, university faculty, special and regular educators, vocational educators, school administrators, an occupational therapist, private enterprise and a computer technician (See Appendix 1). After reviewing sample instruments the panel recommended the first draft that reflected appropriate content for a follow-up study of former special education and at-risk students. This draft was then field tested. A second panel was formed in June 1987 and named the Riverside Cross Agency Advisory Panel (RCAAP). This panel included representatives of major adult service agencies, special and regular educators, parents and other persons significant in the transition process (See Appendix 2). The RCAAP reviewed the first draft of the instrument and the results of the first field test and then provided on-going recommendations and revision assistance across the next three months.

In addition to panel members, other professionals were consulted to provide recommendations for improving the follow-up instrument. After completion of the second draft, project staff consulted with Dr. Charles Abrams, President of Decision Research, Inc., a private personnel survey research agency in Santa Barbara and Dr. Joseph Pasanella of the Santa Barbara High School District for content evaluation and suggestions for revision. The content of the second draft was also examined by Dr. Fred Best of PMRA, who collaborated on another ETC follow-up study, and Rita Marinoble and Judy Hegenauer who developed a Quality of Life Survey Instrument. Their suggestions, revisions, additions and deletions were

evaluated by the Riverside project staff, and the RCAAP then incorporated changes where appropriate. Subsequent drafts of the instrument were reviewed by project members of related ETC grants (NOCROP, PMRA, Quality of Life) and grant managers Patt Kearly, Pat Dougan and Heather Kaney of ETC in Sacramento. In addition, ten school administrators provided feedback on the instrument content and survey method through a structured evaluation form (Appendix 11). The evaluation form, attached to the baseline/follow-up instrument, explained the suggested method for gathering baseline information, tracking students and contacting graduates. It also included a section for comments and suggestions. The overall reaction was positive with several specific suggestions. All respondents felt that the suggested methods were feasible for district use. Some specific suggestions included: a change in the listing of answers for Question #14 "The Type of Degree Earned"; a separate question to address the section in Question #19, "Do you wish you had taken any or more courses"; and dividing Question #19 into two sub-sections, "Regular and Sepcial Education."

FIELD TEST #1

The follow-up instrument was field tested twice to examine reliability across various populations as well as to complete an interview. During field testing, the amount of time needed to complete the interview questions and ease of use of the instrument were also studied. Prior to the preliminary field test of the first draft on seventy-five former special education and other at-risk students, interviewers were identified and trained. Training consisted of:

PHASE I

A. The survey interview form was studied for typographic and content errors. Each item was reviewed and clarified in small groups with discussion where necessary.
B. The interview conditions were discussed including regulations regarding confidentiality, assignments of student identification codes and guidelines for population sample to be studied.
C. Logistics and necessary controls were outlined, including establishment of a contact procedure and letter of transmittal.

PHASE II

A. Dyads were established to role play interviews using factual and fictional characteristics of school graduates.
B. Each interviewer completed one survey interview in the community with an actual member of the population sample using the field test questionnaire.

C. Interviewers participated in small and large group debriefing of the first formal interview with a discussion of both content and method. Groups were facilitated by university faculty who assisted in the critique of the gathered data.
D. Interviewers continued field testing up to 8 more graduates, using the interview questionnaire, followed by an individual review with university faculty.

After each interview, the interviewer completed an evaluation of the instrument and interview procedure by using an Interview Evaluation Form (Appendix 10) developed specifically for this project. Results from the 75 interview evaluation forms were analyzed for internal consistency and revisions were later incorporated into the next draft (See Appendix 5) Data collected from the 75 interviews were tabulated and analyzed using SPSS-X (SPSS, Inc. 1983). Results of this study using the Special Education Graduate Survey will be reported in an article entitled "75 Special Education Graduates Look Back" (Burton, LeRoy, Schultz and Wojciehowski, in process).

Initial Field Test Instrument

A 64 item Special Education Graduate Survey (See Appendix 12) was developed by L. Burton and T. Wojciehowski after a review of related literature and a gathering of sample follow-up surveys. The structured interview was designed to obtain 1) demographic information about former students including types of school programs, and specific medical problems; 2) vocational information including their current employment status, employment histories, vocational training, wages and job satisfaction; 3) independent living including types of residence, domestic skills, and mode of transportation; and 4) personal life styles/quality of life responses that included social service utilization, recreation/leisure activities, and reflections about the general impact of school on their lives. (See Appendix 4)

The instrument was based primarily on Paul Wehman's follow-up form (1985) which, in turn, had been developed from reviewing the Hasazi et al. form (1982). An attempt was made to focus on current employment status and vocational training experiences. At this point it was also decided that the personal interview format would be the most effective and efficient method of data collection. Interviews were conducted with special education graduates/leavers and parents/careproviders. An experimental edition of the survey instrument was designed in March 1987, and a panel of experts representative of a variety of school related professions (See Appendix 1) was established in April 1987 to examine the face validity of individual survey items in both the Wehman form and the experimental edition. The panel noted a few questions that appeared ambiguous or redundant, and these items were either eliminated or modified in the second experimental edition of the instrument. In the second review the panel focused on questions that

could be considered too personal or not directly related to the respondents employability. From this second modification the pilot study form was established in April 1987.

SAMPLE POPULATION

Once the instrument was constructed, professionals in schools and direct services were contacted to help identify a sample population of young adults with mental retardation. The target group was to be graduates or school leavers who had been out of school for the last one to five years with either significant physical challenges (PH) or significant cognitive challenges (mild-moderate MR). Because of lack of documentation it was not possible to interview every target graduate/school leaver so an attempt was made to cover a representative sample of urban, rural and suburban areas. The demographic span would reflect the diversity of Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. A total of 75 interviews were completed. Twenty of the respondents had physical impairments. These young adults, aged 19-25, were identified by previous teachers and adult assistance agencies. The individuals in the sample exhibited severe physical involvement including some with additional cognitive learning difficulties. The 55 other respondents experienced challenges in the mild to moderate mental retardation range. This second sample, also aged 19-25, were identified by former teachers and the local regional center. Some experienced additional physical challenges, as well as emotional difficulties. Of those interviewed in the first two samples 61 percent were male and 39 percent female. The mean age was 22. Forty-three percent of the respondents lived in a suburban setting with 36.3 percent in rural and 20.2 percent in urban residences.

After a sample population was identified 17 masters level special education students (See Appendix 1) were trained to conduct the interviews. As mentioned earlier, the interview format appeared best because of the large amount of data sought and because it was the most reliable mode of accurate data collection as opposed to mail or telephone surveys.

Questionnaire Items

Information from previous studies (Jackson and Rothway, 1961; Walsh, 1968) concluded that a questionnaire used in conjunction with a personal interview would yield a higher rate of return and more complete comprehensive data from respondents. In these studies it was concluded that respondents gave factual information, even when it regarded negative aspects of self, and that they were fairly consistent when their interview and questionnaire responses to fact or yes/no items were compared. One problem with interviews (Borg and Gall, 1978) identifies attention to the response effect, in that some questions, like those asking about income, might be exaggerated or inaccurate due to the interview format. The structured format interview was selected for most survey items.

Because of the field test nature of the survey a semi-structured approach was added to leave questions open for clarification and explanation purposes. The Follow-Up Survey Summary was constructed to check the response effect, individual question bias, and to solicit questions from interviewers regarding further possible changes in format (See Appendix 10).

The completed surveys were coded by interviewer and respondent and entered for statistical analysis using SPSS-X (SPSS. Inc. 1983). Upon com-pletion of their surveys the interviewers gave feedback on the instrument through the Follow-Up Survey Summary. In general, the interviewers felt the survey was comprehensive yet easy to administer. The length of the interviews average one hour plus travel and summary write up. All interviewers responded that the survey took less time as they became familiar with it. They generally had the most success locating interviewees through special education teachers who had kept contacts with former students. They did find barriers to locating interviewees in resistant facility directors, weary parents and case workers who wanted to review all data collected about a client. Many interviewers claimed they needed to restate certain questions to elicit responses they could "sense were there." There was a need to "let the conversation develop around a topic" to open up communication. Perhaps the most significant revelation on the summaries was what many interviewers noted as a "quality of insincerity" in the respondents that could not be measured by the instrument. Many former students seemed to answer in an affect manner, very positive, assuming this is what the interviewer wanted hear. Despite their troubled employment record or lack of skill respondents would almost automatically claim they were "satisfied" with their current job status. This seeming inconsistency caused many interviewers to question the "honesty" or reliability of the answers, given these particular responses.

The data collection method was examined throughout the project period. The first field test was achieved through face-to-face personal interviews and telephone interviews. Analysis of interview evaluation forms and discussions with the 12 interviewers revealed that the personal interview using the first draft of the survey instrument was time consuming, with initial surveys taking 45 minutes to one hour, and later taking as little as 15 to 25 minutes. Transportation to and from the interview and telephone contacts to schedule the time and place of the interview greatly extended the time needed to complete each interview. Telephone interviews varied in length from 10 to 20 minutes, but were reported to be less personal in nature by the interviewers.

INITIAL RESULTS

Although data analysis is not yet complete preliminary results of this field test show that 51.8 percent of the 75 total graduate/school leavers are currently unemployed. And of those who are employed 53.6 percent are in sheltered employment. Forty-eight percent of all those surveyed earn from 0-50 dollars per month. In addition, more than 50 percent of the respondents have one or more medical problems. Eight percent of those interviewed were prepared for this type of success in local segregated sites (39.9%) and Special Day Classes (39.9%).

FIELD TEST #2

A second field test of the revised instrument was conducted by the Riverside County project staff with assistance by members of the RCAAP. Training and preparation for the second field test using the fourth draft of the instrument, followed a procedure similar to the first field test with one addition. A script was developed for use in the survey procedure (See page 35). Small group practice and a critique were completed by the project staff and RCAAP members involved in retrieving information from graduates/leavers. The interviews were then conducted with specific sample populations.

METHOD OF INTERVIEW

For the second field test, methods included face to face personal interviews, telephone contacts, and mail outs. In one case a graduate with deafness was interviewed using a TTY (telecommunication system used by deaf individuals), following telephone interview guidelines. Interview Evaluation Forms (see Appendix 10) were used again and the face to face interview was still found by the interviewers to be the most time consuming. The face-to-face interview did, however, have a higher response rate than encountered with other survey methods. Although a face to face interview is frequently considered the ideal method of conducting an interview, (Borg and Gel, 1979; Isaac and Michael, 1985; Smith, 1981) it is evident that this is a process that could not be replicated in a school system due to limited time and personnel resources. The quality of information gathered and number of mail returns was unsatisfactory and continued mail outs and address verifications resulted in greater time requirements than the telephone interview. Telephone interviews were rated by all interviewers as most effective and efficient. A script, which was used with each interview, assisted the interviewers in adhering closely to the content of the instrument and interviewers reported that the typical interview required approximately 12 minutes each. Appendix 6 summarizes the responses and comments made by interviewers in the second field test.

SAMPLE POPULATION

The field test was conducted in August 1987 which caused limitations in sources of information, since district personnel were not available at this time of year. The project staff relied on contacts through the Riverside Cross Agency Advisory Panel to compile a list of possible participants and interviewers. The time of year also caused limitations in the amount of baseline information that could be obtained on participants, as school records were not available. Available baseline information included: name, address, phone, gender, date of birth and handicapping condition. All participants on the lists of participants had left or completed school one to five years prior to the field test.

The list of possible participants included 161 school leavers/completers from three categories: regular education; at risk (including economically disadvantaged, academically disadvantaged, learning handicapped, juvenile offenders, drug and alcohol abusers, and pregnant minors), special education (including severely emotionally disturbed, physically handicapped, communicatively handicapped and mentally handicapped). Attempts were made to contact a random sample of 131 of the 161 possible participants.

When contacting a participant, the interviewers introduced themselves as representatives of the school or agency serving as the source of the contact. They explained the purpose of the interview and attempted to gather the data on the questionnaire. If the former student was not able to respond in person to the questionnaire, a parent or careprovider was the respondent.

The breakdown of the population interviewed is as follows:

At Risk:	57 Attempted 18 Completed
Special Education:	54 Attempted 35 Completed
Regular Education (ROP):	20 Attempted 7 Completed

Of the at-risk group, all 18 interviews were conducted with the former student. Of the special education group, 30 interviews were conducted with the respondent and 5 with a third party. In the regular education group, all 7 interviews were conducted with the former student.

RESULTS OF SURVEY

The second field test revealed differences in the response rate of follow-up interviews for each method of contact (phone, face-to-face, and mail), and the population contacted (at-risk, special education, and regular education). The field test also provided valuable information about the content and format of the follow-up instrument. Other evaluative information gained from the field test includes the amount

of time needed to complete an interview, confidentiality issues, the reaction of the interviewee to the questions, the types of probing needed to get accurate answers and which questions needed more clarification (See Appendix 6).

POPULATION AND METHOD OF CONTACT

The at-risk former students were found to be the most difficult group to contact. Attempts were made to contact fifty-seven at-risk former students with only eighteen of these completed. The primary reason for the low response rate was difficulty in locating the former student. All three methods of contact were used with this group (see chart below). Face-to-face interviews yielded the highest response rate with six out of seven interviews completed. Telephone contact had a low rate of response rate with ten completed interviews out of forty-four attempts.

The special education group had a 100 percent response rate for face-to-face interviews. Telephone interviews were less successful with only four of thirteen attempts completed. Mailing the follow-up instrument was unsuccessful as there were no responses to the ten forms mailed out.

The regular education former students showed a similar response rate with three completed telephone interviews of ten attempts. There was a lower response rate as compared to the other groups using the face-to-face method with six attempts and three completed.

Several consistent barriers were encountered when contacting the former students in the field test sample, the most common of which was no answer at the last known phone number. Other barriers included disconnected phone numbers and phone numbers and addresses that were no longer accurate. It is important to note that the response rate of face-to-face interviews was dependent on the ability of the interviewer to reach the former student by phone. Once an interviewer contacted the former student, they were successful in scheduling and completing the face-to-face interview.

POPULATION AND METHOD OF CONTACT

CONTACT / POPULATION	Telephone		Face-to Face		Mail		Totals	
	Attempted	Completed	Attempted	Completed	Attempted	Completed	Attempted	Completed
At-Risk	44	10	7	6	6	2	57	18
Special Education	13	4	31	31	10	0	54	35
Regular Education	10	3	6	3	4	1	20	7
Total	67	17	44	40	20	3	131	60

INTERVIEW EVALUATION

After each interview was completed, the interviewer evaluated the interview and the follow-up instrument using an evaluation form (See Appendix 10) developed by project staff. Results from these evaluations show consistent findings from all of the interviewers (See Appendix 6).

A brief summary of these findings includes time needed to complete interviews, confidentiality problems, and need for probing or clarification to get accurate information. The time needed to complete the interviews was ten minutes for fifty percent and fifteen to twenty minutes for twenty-five percent. Confidentiality was not an issue with most of the interviewees. An explanation of how confidentiality would be handled was needed only four times in sixty interviews. It was found that probling and clarification were needed for twelve of the questions from the fourth draft instrument.

The evaluation form also included a section for interviewer comments about the interview. Interviewers felt it was hard to do a face-to-face interview because the interviewee could sense bias through body language and facial expressions. Many questions needed to be reworded for students with language processing problems. Face-to-face interviews were longer because the interviewee talked more, got off track, and asked for assistance in handling adjustment problems which came up during the interview.

BASELINE INFORMATION

(to be filled out by student)

A. What is your employment situation?:

[ ] Working, Full Time
[ ] Working, Part Time
[ ] Not working (If not working, go to #21)

B. How much money do you make per hour on this job? $ _____ (on average)

C. What is your job title ?

_____

D. What are your job duties? _____
_____

E. What is the name of the company or organization you work for?

_____

F. Now we want to know what you hope to do over the next two years. Mark ONE category which best describes your plans.

What do you plan to do for the next two years?

[ ] Enter military service
[ ] Go to vocational, technical, business or trade schools
[ ] Become a full-time homemaker
[ ] Go to college
[ ] Enter apprenticeships or on-the-job training programs
[ ] Go to work full-time
[ ] I don't know
[ ] Other:

_____
(write in)

SCHOOL RECORD INFORMATION

(to be filled out by school personnel -- teacher/case carrier)

ID #: _____

1. Student Name: _____
2. Address: _____
   _____
3. Mailing Address: _____
   (if different) _____
4. Date of Birth: _____
5. Social Security #: _____
6. Driver's License #: _____
7. Student's Phone #: _____
8. Parent/Guardian's Phone #: _____
9. Sex:
   [ ] Male
   [ ] Female
10. Racial/Ethnic Group:
    [ ] Caucasian
    [ ] Black (non-Hispanic)
    [ ] Asian/Pacific Islander
    [ ] Hispanic
    [ ] American Indian
    [ ] Other: _____
11. Current living with:
    [ ] Parent(s)
    [ ] Relative
    [ ] Self
    [ ] Careprovider: _____
    (type of facility)
    [ ] Other: _____
12. School name: _____ Zip Code: _____
13. Which ONE of the following best describes the most recent high school program in which the student was enrolled?
    [ ] General education **(skip to #18)**
    [ ] Academic/College Preparatory **(skip to #18)**
    [ ] Vocational or Technical **(skip to #18)**
    [ ] Special Education/Resource Program **(continue to #14)**

14. Major program classification for majority of high school/last four years of school:

[ ] Learning Handicapped:
- Learning Disabled _____
- Mildly Mentally Handicapped _____

[ ] Communicatively Handicapped:
- Aphasic _____
- Aurally Handicapped _____
- Deaf and Hard of Hearing _____
- Speech _____

[ ] Severely Handicapped:
- Multiply Handicapped _____
- Developmentally Disabled _____
- Autistic _____
- Severely Emotionally Disturbed _____
- Deaf/Blind _____
- Severely Mentally Handicapped _____

[ ] Physically Handicapped:
- Cerebral Palsy _____
- Visually Handicapped _____
- Orthopedically Handicapped _____
- Health Related _____

15. Type of program(s) and approximate percentages of time in program(s) for this student during the past four years of school:
- [ ] Resource Room _____ %
- [ ] Special Day Class _____ %
- [ ] Special Day School _____ %
- [ ] Residential School _____ %
- [ ] Developmental Center _____ %
- [ ] Hospital/Home _____ %
- [ ] Consultant/Itinerant _____ %

16. Who would best be able to accurately respond to questions about the student's situation (employment, education) two years from now?

- [ ] Student
- [ ] Student, with assistance: Specify Name: _____ Relationship: _____

17. For information student can provide, what is the recommended method of conducting a follow-up interview?

- [ ] Phone Interview
- [ ] Personal Interview/Observation
- [ ] Augmented Communication Device: Specify: _____

18. Has this student been a participant in any of the following programs?

(Mark one response on each line)

Yes	No	
[ ]	[ ]	Upward Bound
[ ]	[ ]	Work/Coop Programs
[ ]	[ ]	Work/Study Programs
[ ]	[ ]	Juvenile Offender Programs
[ ]	[ ]	Teen Parenting Programs
[ ]	[ ]	Alcohol/Drug Abuse Programs
[ ]	[ ]	Economically Disadvantaged Programs
[ ]	[ ]	ESL/LEP Programs

19. How many years in above program(s)? **(See #15 and #18)** _____

20. What type of certificate will be earned from the program?

[ ] Diploma
[ ] Diploma through Differential Standards
[ ] High School Equivalency Certificate/GED
[ ] Certificate of Completion (Special Education)
[ ] Other: _____

21. Month/year of exit from school? _____

22. Can the interview be conducted in English?

[ ] Yes
[ ] No: Please specify: _____

23. Who is the permanent contact, other than parents, who would know the whereabouts of this student for the next two years?

Name: _____

Address: _____

_____

Phone: _____

Relationship: _____

24. What is the major curriculum thrust for the student?

[ ] Core curriculum; i.e. diploma-seeking, regular district curricula
(Complete Question 25a only)

[ ] Special curriculum; i.e. community-based, functional/critical activities
(Complete Question 25b only)

25a.

SUBJECT AREAS	Did you/the student take any courses in this area? Yes	No/NA
[A] Math	[ ]	[ ]
[B] English/Literature/Writing	[ ]	[ ]
[C] Science	[ ]	[ ]
[D] Social Studies	[ ]	[ ]
[E] Health	[ ]	[ ]
[F] Foreign Language	[ ]	[ ]
[G] Drama/Speech	[ ]	[ ]
[H] Art/Music	[ ]	[ ]
[I] Physical Education	[ ]	[ ]
[J] Family Life/Sex Education	[ ]	[ ]
[K] Home Economics/Consumer Education	[ ]	[ ]
[L] Agriculture/Horticulture/Forestry	[ ]	[ ]
[M] Business/Office	[ ]	[ ]
[N] Merchandising/Retail	[ ]	[ ]
[O] Medical/Hospital	[ ]	[ ]
[P] Industrial/Technical	[ ]	[ ]
[Q] Work Experience/Training/ROP: Specify Class: _____	[ ]	[ ]

25b.

[A]	Vocational:		
	On-Campus Training: _____	[ ]	[ ]
	(specify) _____	[ ]	[ ]
	_____	[ ]	[ ]
	Off-Campus Training: _____	[ ]	[ ]
	(specify) _____	[ ]	[ ]
	_____	[ ]	[ ]
[B]	Recreation/Leisure:		
	Hobbies	[ ]	[ ]
	Sports, Physical Activity	[ ]	[ ]
	Home Entertainment	[ ]	[ ]
	Clubs	[ ]	[ ]
	Other: _____	[ ]	[ ]
[C]	Community:		
	Shopping	[ ]	[ ]
	Restaurant	[ ]	[ ]
	Ride Public Transportation	[ ]	[ ]
	Cross Streets	[ ]	[ ]
	Other: _____	[ ]	[ ]
[D]	Domestic:		
	Eating	[ ]	[ ]
	Toileting	[ ]	[ ]
	Cooking	[ ]	[ ]
	Grooming	[ ]	[ ]
	Other: _____	[ ]	[ ]

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE

I. **PERSONAL INFORMATION:**

1. Name of Former Student: _____

2. Name of Respondent (if different from Student): _____

3. Relationship to Former Student: _____
(* If respondent is different from student, please ask questions in the third person; e.g.: #4, "What is former student's marital status?")

4. What is your marital status?
[ ] Single
[ ] Married
[ ] Divorced/separated

5. How many dependent children do you have? _____ **(If single or divorced/separated, skip to #7)**

6. Is your spouse working?
[ ] Yes
[ ] No

7. Do you receive money from a source other than employment (i.e. parents, SSI, AFDC, etc.)?
[ ] No
[ ] Yes; specify: _____

8. What is your current living situation? Lives with:
[ ] Parents
[ ] Relative
[ ] Friend
[ ] Alone
[ ] Care Provider: Type of facility: _____
[ ] Other: Specify: _____

For Office Use Only:

Subject ID #: _____

According to Student Record Question # 24, Respondent will answer
22a _____
22b _____

II. **VOCATIONAL OUTCOMES**

9. What is your current job situation?
[ ] Employed full time
[ ] Employed part time
[ ] Self employed
[ ] Military **(proceed to Question #20)**
[ ] Not employed **(proceed to Question #20)**
[ ] Volunteer work
[ ] Other: _____

10. What is your job title? _____

11. What are your main duties? _____
_____

12. What is the name of the company or organization that you work for?
_____

13. How many hours a week do you work? _____ (on average)

14. How much money do you make per hour on this job? $_____ (on average)

15. Do you receive benefits from your employer? Yes _____ No _____

16. How long have you been working in this job?
_____ weeks
_____ months
_____ years

17. How long did it take you to find the first job after leaving high school?
[ ] Current job continued from work during high school
[ ] Weeks (if less than 1 week)
[ ] Months
[ ] Years

18. Who helped you find this job?
[ ] Rehabilitation/Habilitation Counselor
[ ] Case worker/Social worker
[ ] School teacher/counselor
[ ] Employment agency
[ ] EDD - Employment Development Department
[ ] JTPA
[ ] Parent/relative/friend
[ ] Found job independently
[ ] Other: _____

19. How do you get to work?
[ ] Walk
[ ] Drives self
[ ] Public transportation (Bus)
[ ] Parent/friend drives
[ ] Facility bus
[ ] Other: _____

20. How many jobs have you held since completing school, including your current job?
[ ] 0
[ ] 1 (Same job)
[ ] 2-3
[ ] 4-6
[ ] 7 or more

Proceed to #22 if employed

21. What is the most important reason that you are not working now?

[ ] Lack of work skills
[ ] Lack of transportation
[ ] Concern with loss of SSI benefits
[ ] Do not want a job
[ ] Homemaker
[ ] Health related problems
[ ] Post secondary school/vocational training
[ ] Resigned/tired from last job
[ ] Lack of supported work program
[ ] Other: _____

III. [redacted]

22a.

	Fill in according to S.R.I. form		If YES, how much do you use what you learned?			Interviewer: Code responses to (R) and (S)
	YES	NO	FREQUENTLY	SOMETIMES	SELDOM	
(A) [redacted]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(B) English/Literature/Writing	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(C) Science	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(D) Social Studies	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(E) Health	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(F) Foreign Language	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(G) Drama/Speech	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(H) Art/Music	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(I) Physical Education	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(J) Family Life/Sex Education	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(K) Home Economics/Consumer Education	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(L) Agriculture/Horticulture/Forestry	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(M) Business/Office	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(N) Merchandising/Retail	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(O) Medical/Hospital	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(P) Industrial/Technical	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(Q) Work Experience/Training/WEP: Specify Class: _____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

(R) Are there any courses you wish you had taken more of in these areas?
[ ] No
[ ] Yes; Specify: _____
(Code in last column)

(S) Are there any other courses you wish you had taken?
[ ] No
[ ] Yes; Specify: _____
(Code in last column)

22b.

	Fill in according to S.R.I. form		If YES, how much do you use what you learned?			Interviewer: Code responses to (E) and (F)
	YES	NO	FREQUENTLY	SOMETIMES	SELDOM	
(A) Vocational:						
On-Campus Training: _____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(specify) _____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Off-Campus Training: _____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(specify) _____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(B) Recreation/Leisure:						
Hobbies	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Sports, Physical Activity	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Home Entertainment	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Clubs	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Other: _____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(C) Community:						
Shopping	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Restaurant	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Ride Public Transportation	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Cross Streets	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Other: _____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(D) Domestic:						
Eating	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Toileting	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Cooking	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Grooming	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Other: _____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

(E) Are there any courses you wish you had taken more of in these areas?

[ ] No

[ ] Yes; Specify: _____
(Code in last column)

(F) Are there any other courses you wish you had taken?

[ ] No

[ ] Yes; Specify: _____
(Code in last column)

23. During your school years, was there a person in your life who was very helpful in planning for your future?
[ ] Yes
[ ] No

If yes, who was that person ? _____
(relationship)

19. LIFE SATISFACTION

24. Who do you spend most of your free time with?

[ ] Family
[ ] Friends
[ ] General Public
[ ] Alone

25. In general, how do you feel about:	Don't Know/NA	Not At All Happy (Terrible)	Not Too Happy (Pretty Bad)	Happy Now & Then (OK)	Fairly Happy (Pretty Good)	Extremely Happy (Great)
(1) Your work situation?	0	1	2	3	4	5
(2) The amount of money you have?	0	1	2	3	4	5
(3) Your overall living situation (where you live, who you live with, and the accommodations) ?	0	1	2	3	4	5
(4) The choices and decisions you make about your life?	0	1	2	3	4	5
(5) The way you handle problems?	0	1	2	3	4	5
(6) Your physical and mental health?	0	1	2	3	4	5
(7) Your ability to get to community services and activities?	0	1	2	3	4	5
(8) The amount of control you have over the things that happen to you?	0	1	2	3	4	5
(9) Your use and the amount of Recreation and Leisure activities available to you?	0	1	2	3	4	5
(10) Your ability to get and keep close friends?	0	1	2	3	4	5
(11) The way your life is going these days?	0	1	2	3	4	5
(12) The amount of time you spend doing things away from home?	0	1	2	3	4	5

GENERAL DIRECTIONS FOR INTERVIEWERS

Please make sure you have read and understand all of the following directions before you start to schedule and interview.

PHONE INTERVIEW

Before you call, make sure you have:

- Pencils
- Complete interview form ready
- Completed baseline information
  - Name of Respondent
  - Name of former student
  - ID Number
  - Course information

  *Responses should be transferred (either by hand or computer program) from the Student Record Information form Question #25a or #25b to the Follow-Up Questionnaire form Question #22a or #22b.

If asked why you are doing this study:

"We are trying to evaluate the effectiveness of our school programs so that we can improve them."

Scheduling:

- Make attempts at a variety of times between 9 am/9 pm
- Record contact information on call sheet and place in appropriate box

Calling procedures:

- Let phone ring 8 times
- Ask to speak to the respondent printed on the Interview Form
- Ask if this is a good time to call
- If respondent is willing to participate - continue:
  - If respondent is not available, ask when to call back.
  - If this is a bad time, ask for time to call back.
  - If you have arranged to call back, be sure to do so.
- If respondent is reluctant:
  - If there is a hesitation, try to persuade. Sample statements to use:
    - "This won't take much time, we really would like your opinion."
    - "All of your responses will be confidential. We do not use individual names when we compile the results of our survey."
    - Explain that the study is designed to assess the effectiveness of the school program so that it can be improved upon in the future.
    - Explain that the interview would only take 20 minutes. or offer to call back at a different time.

*Remember, respondent is not obligated to answer questions. If there is an objection to certain questions, provide assurance that this is acceptable and move on to the next question.

PERSONAL INTERVIEW

Scheduling appointments:

Before you call to schedule, make sure you have:

Pencil
Calendar
Note pad for directions

Explain purpose of call:

"My name is _____. I'm with (Name and district). We are doing our annual follow-up study of students who completed/graduated from school in 19___. I would like to set up an appointment to meet with you to talk about the activities and jobs you had during school and since leaving school."

If asked why you are doing this study:

"We are trying to evaluate the effectiveness of our school programs so that we can improve them."

If respondent is willing to participate: Set up time, place, get directions, if necessary. Thank respondent for their time.

If respondent is reluctant:
If there is hesitation, try to persuade. Sample statements to use:

"It won't take much time, and we really would like your opinion."
"All of your responses will be confidential. We do not use individual names when we compile the results of our survey."
Explain that the study is designed to assess the effectiveness of the school program so that it can be improved upon in the future.
Explain that the interview would only take 20 minutes or offer to meet them at a place of their choice.
Suggest that they have a friend or relative present during the visit if they're reluctant to meet you alone.

Interviewing Procedures:

Introduce yourself. Thank respondent for his/her time. (Remember you are a guest in his/her home)
Try to sit facing person who will be interviewed, make frequent eye contact.
Maintain open body language.
Be careful not to give any opinion verbally or non-verbally.
If he/she is concerned with time, assure him/her that it should take only 20 minutes to complete the interview.

FOR PHONE AND PERSONAL INTERVIEW

Recording responses:

Please mark (X) the appropriate box. On items with "blanks" for fill in, please write respondent's verbatim answer.

How to probe for answers:

Before accepting, "I don't know," be sure to probe.
Some examples:

"Yes, I see," stated expectantly then pause.
"Could you be a little more specific?"
"I'm not sure I am entirely clear about what you mean, could you explain it a little more?"
"Could I read back what I have written down to be sure I have exactly what you wanted to say?"

* Do not be overly chatty. Keep it to a minimum and use your discretion. Avoid interjecting your own opinion about survey questions as this may influence responses.

If respondent misunderstands a question:

It is easy for respondents to miss a word and, therefore, misunderstand the question. If you think this has happened, say. . .

"Could I reread the question and the answer I have written to make sure I have everything you wanted to say?"
"I think I may not have read the question correctly; may I read it again to be sure?"

Take notes during the interview:

Notes may be written on the interview form next to the question. Try to get comments in verbatim form.

Completing the interview:

Go over each question to make sure it was completed correctly. Record problems or questions that may have arisen.

Confidentiality:

Please keep the interviews confidential. Do not tell anyone the substance of an interview. The interview may be discussed only with the designated person in charge of the study.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE INTERVIEWER

Before beginning to complete any interviews, please read all of the general directions and the following instructions/script.

Please make sure you understand all of the questions and how to conduct the interview before you start. If you have any questions, please call _____ at _____.

SCRIPT

The Interview

Telephone

"Hello, my name is _____. I'm with _____. I'm looking for _____. Do I have the right number for _____? We are doing our annual follow-up study of students who completed/graduated from school in 19__/19__. We are interested in talking to former students about the activities and jobs they have had during school and since leaving school."

If reluctant: "Is this a good time to call? It will only take about 20 minutes. Is there a better time for me to call back?"

If they want to continue: "I'd like to talk to you about what you've been doing this past year."

Face-to-Face

"Hello, my name is _____. I talked with you on _____ to schedule our meeting for a follow-up interview. (Please limit small talk. Be polite and establish a rapport with the respondent before starting the interview.)

If another person is responding for the student, please ask questions in third person.

1. - 3. Information should be filled in according to School Record Information form.

4. Read question (If respondent is unclear, read list of responses.)

5. Read question (If unclear, explain - "dependent children are ones who live with you and for whom you are responsible.")

6. Read question

7. Read question - (Use list to probe if needed)

8. Read question - (Use list to probe if needed)

9. Read question

10. Read question

11. Read question

12. Read question

13. Read question

14. Read question - If respondent is unable to give hourly rate, convert weekly or monthly pay according to number of hours worked per week (See #13)

15. Read question (If unclear, "Do you have things like sick leave, vacation time, medical insurance?")

16. Read question

17. Read question

18. Read question (Use list to probe if needed)

19. Read question (Use list to probe if needed)

20. Read question (You may have to help interviewee count)

21. Read question (Use list to probe if needed)

22a. and 22b. "According to your school records, you've taken a variety of courses. I'm going to read through them one at a time ... tell me how much you use what you learned (frequently, sometimes, or seldom)." Read through items checked "yes."

If student answers "yes" to [R] or [S] for 22a or [E] or [F] for 22b, please mark the last column.

23. Read question

24. Read question (Use list to probe if necessary)

25. "I'm going to read a list of statements to you. I want you to tell me how happy you are about each statement."

Equivalent responses:

1) Not at all happy - Terrible - Awful - Never Happy
2) Not too happy - Pretty bad - Seldom happy
3) Happy now & then - OK - Not good, not bad - Alright
4) Fairly happy - Pretty good - Usually happy
5) Extremely happy - Terrific - Great - Always happy

If respondent cannot give an answer, mark "0" (Don't know, not applicable).

If respondent finds it easier to answer using a scale you may suggest: "I'm going to read a list of statements to you. Please rate each statement one through five -- for example: one is not at all happy, terrible; three is O.K., happy now and then; five is extremely happy, terrific."

Read question. If respondent is a third party, say "How do you think _____ would answer the following question?"
former student

TIMELINE OF ACTIVITIES IN DEVELOPMENT OF THE FOLLOW-UP INSTRUMENT AND PROCEDURES GUIDE

	ACTIVITY	DATE
1.	Retrieval and examination of follow-up studies and instruments utilized in a regional or state sample through personal contact with authors (Hasazi - Vermont Study, Wehman - Virginia Study, Mithaug, Colorado Study, and Brown - Wisconsin Study).	4/87
2.	Development of first draft of follow up instrument, designed mainly on the format and content of the Virginia study - severely handicapped and the Vermont study - learning handicapped.	4/87
3.	Analysis, deletions, editing and extensive additions of first draft by 20 member panel of experts made up of representatives from parents, university faculty, special and regular educators, vocational education, school administration, occupational therapy, private enterprise and computer technology experts.	4/87-5/87
4.	Completion and revision of <u>first draft</u> of instrument.	
5.	Identification of sample population of approximately 90 former students who had completed school during the past three years. Sample included persons previously labeled as PH, SH, LH, CH, and non-special education "at risk"	5/87
6.	Development of a procedure to evaluate the draft of the interview instrument using a form to be used by each interviewer upon completion of each interview.	5/87
7.	Formation of a procedure to use in conducting interviews.	5/87
8.	Selection and training of interviewers to insure consistency in the administration of the instrument.	5/87
9.	Completion of first field test on 75 former students in rural and urban settings in Riverside and San Bernardino Counties using a personal interview - method.	6/87
10.	Analysis of results of first draft interview by coding and entering data for distributional and cross tabular analysis using SPSS-X (SPSS. Inc. 1983).	6/87

11. Analysis and compilation of first draft results from 75 interview evaluation forms used by interviewers to determine item validity. 6/87-7/87

12. Request of information from 132 State of California schools and agencies to secure information on whether or not they used a follow-up procedure and to request copies of instruments and reports. 6/87

13. Formulation of the Riverside Cross Agency Advisory Panel (RCAAP) comprised of 11 persons representing significant agencies impacted by the transition process. Membership includes leadership and other personnel from rehabilitation, special education, parent/care providers, habilitation, school administration, mental health, private enterprise, Regional Center, Vocational Education, supported work agencies and higher education. 6/87

14. Review and revision of <u>first draft</u> of field test instrument with RCAAP. 6/87

15. Development of a systematic review form to use in analyzing the instruments gathered from across the nation and state. 7/87

16. Development of a systematic review form to use in analyzing content of each publication relating to follow-up with special populations. 7/87

17. Development of <u>second draft</u> of the instrument based on feedback from RCAAP, review of literature and examination of instruments received from statewide studies (6) and regional and local studies in California (55). 7/87

18. Participation in various joint meetings with PMRA, Quality of Life and NOCROP project staff to coordinate and align all four projects. 7/87, 8/87-9/87

19. Consultation with Dr. Charles Abrams of DECISION RESEARCH, (Santa Barbara) an agency with a long history of experience conducting follow-up surveys for school and agencies nationwide. Dr. Abrams reviewed each item on the instrument draft and made several significant suggestions, and provided permission for us to modify one item of their instrument which relates to the former students school program. Also consulted with Joe Pasanella, Transition specialist with Santa Barbara School District relative to usability of the follow-up instrument. 7/87

20. Collaboration with Rita Marinoble and Judy Hegenauer (Quality of Life Staff) to thoroughly analyze the draft of the follow-up and the quality of life instruments. Gained consensus on meshing the two instruments. 7/87

21. Development of third draft of the instrument based on input from PMRA, Quality of Life, NOCROP staff as well as Decision Research, Dr. Pasanella and Riverside County project staff. 7/87

22. Development of methods and procedures to field test third draft of follow up instrument. 7/87

23. Development of script to use in conducting interview. 7/87

24. Review of third draft with Advisory Panel (RCAAP). 7/87

25. Development of fourth draft, based on recommendations of RCAAP. 7/87

26. Submission of draft of instrument, script, baseline information sheet and outline of activities to date to ETC, NOCROP, Quality of Life, PMRA and Jon Ebeling. 7/87

27. Identification of a sample of former students representative of various disabilities and high risk groups. 7/87

28. Completion of field testing of fourth draft of instrument on sample population of approximately 60 students utilizing personal, telephone, TTY and mail out procedures. 7/87-8/87

29. Development of form for school administrators to use in reviewing and evaluating the fourth draft of the follow-up instrument. 8/87

30. Distribution of fourth draft of instrument to 10 school administrators to secure their perception of the process as well as to obtain recommendations for changes, deletion and additions. 8/87

31. Analysis of results of interviews, considering population sample and survey method (telephone, personal, TTY, mail). 8/87

32. Analysis of interview feedback forms to identify strengths, weaknesses, ambiguity and omissions of the instrument and the method of interview. 8/87

33. Revision and refinement of instrument and script on basis of input from field test, and the RCAAP. 8/87

34. Provide input to PMRA project staff relative to the appropriating of a manual which will eventually accompany the Riverside County Instrument (See Appendix 14) 9/2/87

35. Submit fourth draft to Quality of Life, NCROP and PMRA project staff for input. 9/2/87

36. Submit copies of fourth draft to expert field reviews at California State University San Francisco. 9/20/87

37. Review of Revisions made by an ETC Technical Review Team. Suggested revisions to the Riverside County Follow-up instrument examined and a response was developed. (See Appendix 7) 9/17/87

38. Review of suggested revisions with RCAAP. Revisions made were appropriate. 9/18/87

39. Meeting at ETC with Project Directors from Riverside County, NCROP, PMRA and Quality of Life grants for analysis and technical modifications for coordinating the follow-up instrument with a manual and computer system being developed by either grant. 9/15-18/87

40. Develop fifth and final draft. 10/1/87

41. Submit to ETC. 10/9/87

RECOMMENDATIONS

Further studies to document the activities and adjustments of former students have been recommended throughout the literature. In a 1977 study reporting the poor employment achievement of former special education students, Wilton et al. (1977) recommended a comprehensive evaluation system to monitor the progress of former students. Dalton (1978) recommended the development of management information systems to organize client data for outcome research and therefore measure how services effect success. In 1983, Gibson and Fields reviewed findings from a 50 year study of residential facilities for individuals with mental retardation and recommended similar accountability research which could impact greatly on community based services. Bellamy (1985) recommended that other states replicate the post-school follow-up study done in Vermont (Hasazi, 1985) and suggested that the results would provide a broad data base to utilize in improving schooling and adult service linkages. Edgar (1985) called for additional in depth follow-up studies of former special education students to provide a basis for program evaluation. There are other studies all recommending the collection of more systematic follow-up information.

Findings of the present study support these recommendations. This attempt to develop recommended procedures and data collection instruments for a systematic follow-up process is but one step in the collaborative effort needed to formalize a state wide system for California. Throughout the period of investigation and development certain recommendations have been apparent and are noted here for those who would carry this on-going process a step further.

1. There needs to be a systematic follow-up instrument and procedure to begin to collect a bory of uniform, reliable data on the employment histories, living situations and quality of life achieved by former special education students.

2. The systematic follow-up instrument should be consistent across all related adult service agencies to establish a common language.

3. The follow-up instrument developed here should be field tested for three years with schools and related adult agencies across California.

4. Following further field testing, modification in the instrument should lead to adoption of an acceptable and useful cross agency follow-up instrument.

5. A Cross Agency Advisory Committee and should be actively involved during the field test procedures to insure usability among various school and adult services.

6. On-going review of the appropriateness of specific items and the need for format or content revisions should be incorporated into a timeline for on-going product evaluation.

7. The instrument should be modified, when necessary by local districts and agencies. The tiered design of the instrument allows for additions of local or population specific items without overhauling the form.

8. Existing data banks such as DECISION RESEARCH (1987) The National Longitudinal Survey on High School Youth (1972) and High School & Beyond (Owings & Stocking, 1985) should be consulted and used as a comparison data base in interpreting findings of follow-up research.

9. In the absence of a state-wide data analysis mechanism, raw data can be coded and entered for distribution and cross tabular analysis using SPSS-X (SPSS Inc, 1983). (The reader will please note that DDC Grant No. 8.3.3.08 agreed to assume major responsibility for developing and recommending an appropriate data collection systems to use with schools and adult service agencies in California. See Appendix I3 for agreement).

10. Prior to interview contact, baseline information should be gathered during the last year of school and checked to determine whether or not interpretive services or augmentative communication devices are needed.

11. The method of interview should be telephone except for contacts with students with more severe cognitive or communicative challenges, or where there is no telephone access. In these cases personal interviews should be used. Mail out follow-up surveys were found to yield poor results (Edgar and Levine, 1987; Clonnger, 1976). Creative ways to attract graduate/leavers to come to a central point for interviews (i.e. - a reunion or banquet) are recommended as an alternative to personal interview.

12. Careful consideration should be given to identifying the individualized data collection method more appropriate for use with individuals with more severe disabilities. Careful selection and training of all interviewers is essential for reliable follow up data.

13. Additional research utilizing follow-up data at the local, regional and state level should be encouraged as a means to further identify implications for program improvement.

14. Findings of follow-up studies should be made available to a wide range of individuals and agencies and should, where possible, be published in a form which will be retrievable over time.

15. Follow-up data should be collected on a yearly basis for at least two years following school completion.

16. A brief address correction verification card should be mailed to the most likely current address six months and eighteen months following school completion (in order to keep track of the whereabouts of former students in the interim period).

17. A follow-up process for California should be adopted as soon as possible and appropriate resources should be provided for state-wide implementation.

CONCLUSIONS

Through a process of field testing and gaining input from many reliable sources, instrument drafts and procedures were developed and revised. The culmination of this process is the follow-up instrument and procedures contained in this report.

The timeline of activities (see page 41) lists the activities that led to our final product. The major findings that influenced our instruments and procedures were:

1. The significant indicators of post-school adjustment are vocational outcomes, further training and education and life satisfaction.

2. The same instrument should be used with different groups of students, e.g., Special Education, Regular Education, in order to make comparisons. However, the instrument should contain subsections that are appropriate to each group, especially in the area of educational background.

3. The most effective, cost-efficient and non-biased method of collecting information is via telephone interview. Periodic updates of current address and telephone numbers help to assure a higher response rate.

PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES

The following Procedural Guidelines were developed by grant project staff from the Riverside County Office of Education. Materials were excerpted and adapted from a Follow-Up Handbook written for the Educational Transition Center in collaboration with:

a.1.4: Synthesis of Strategies/Quality of Life
Rita Marinoble and Associates
Rita Marinoble Project Director
Judy Hepenauer, Project Consultant

a.1.2.03: Analysis of Follow-Up Systems
Riverside County Office of Education
Louise Fulton Burton, Consulting Director
Robin Faigin, Project Staff
Rebecca Towner, Project Staff
Tom Wojciehowski, Project Consultant

a.3.3.08: Analysis of Follow-Up Systems
Pacific Management and Research Associates
Fred Best, Project Director
John Ebeling, Senior Consultant
Frederica Shockley, Senior Consultant

a.2.1: Quality Indicators, Accountability and Data Management
North Orange County Regional Occupational Program
Don Cardinal, Project Director
David Drew, Senior Consultant
David Mank, Senior Consultant

Patt Geerly, Ph.D., Project Manager
Educational Transition Center
California State Department of Education

These guidelines provide step-by-step directions and sample forms and letters that can be used by the person or agency responsible for implementing a follow-up study.

PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES

If you want to conduct successful follow-up studies, you will need to complete certain critical tasks in proper sequence. You should carefully follow the five stages in the order specified in this chapter.

I Determine the Scope of Your Data Collection.
II Identify Data Sources.
III Assess your resource needs and finalize your goals.
IV Prepare for follow-up data collection and collect baseline data.
V Collect your follow-up data.

These instructions allow you some flexibility to make adjustments for your local needs. However, you need to preview this entire section and before you decide what to include or exclude from your own survey.

I. DETERMINE SCOPE OF DATA COLLECTION

You will find that decisions made in this initial phase will greatly determine the kind of information you finally have ready to analyze. For example, if you forget to ask some questions at the initial data collection period, your former students may not be able to remember or they may give you different answers when you call them two years later. Let's say that you wait two years after they graduate to ask them if they enjoyed their high school experiences. Some of them, reflecting on the 2 years' struggle since graduation, report that they did enjoy high school. Had you asked them the same question during their senior year they may have told you that they hated it! Hence, it is vital to carefully weigh your decisions about what to collect and how to collect it.

A. Target the students and agencies to contact

Your first task is to determine the general scope of students that you want to include in your follow-up study. Or, more specifically, you will need to decide whether to take a census or a sample of students. You will need to use random selection procedures for the study of the general education students. It should be used when you take a sample (i.e., interview some of the group rather than everyone in the group.)

We have designed this follow-up handbook so that you will collect data on all students at the point of graduation regardless of whether they are special or general education students. After baseline questionnaires are completed, you can sample the completed baseline questionnaires according to the demands of the research task.

(1) Select the special education students to survey

The number of students that you study will significantly affect the scope and cost of your follow-up study. If you decide to follow-up all special education students who have attended the schools in your district, and if the district is large, the scope of your research will be wide and quite costly. You will want to limit the scope of your study to current graduates only in order to stay within your budget.

If you are planning to make comparisons between different sub-groups, e.g., minorities and non-minorities, you will need larger sample sizes. If you want to compare female minorities, male minorities, female non-minorities, and male non-minorities, you will need a larger sample than if you are content to compare only two sub-groups at a time.

The worst type of studies are those that rely upon convenience for collecting the data. For example, you will find it a lot easier to interview all conveniently located special education students who are able and willing to give you some answers. However, if you relied only on those students who were easy to contact, you will probably get a biased sample. Maybe they are easy to locate because they are unwilling to move away from home for better job opportunities or better post high school education and training.

2) Select the general education students to survey

While you will have collected information from each of the general education students who are graduating, you may want to only follow-up on a random sample of the general education students. We recommend that you take a sample of general education students that is equal to the number of special education students who are in your population of graduating seniors. We recommend this procedure so that you will not have problems with statistical weighting procedures when come to doing the comparisons at the end of the study.

3) Decide which agencies will be helpful

You may need to decide which agencies and community groups you want to contact when you need help tracking down former graduates in your target groups. The following agencies may be helpful: Regional Centers, Department of Rehabilitation, Community Mental Health, County Welfare, local public and private hospitals and various city and county social services.

It is important that before launching the follow-up project that you contact those agencies to determine what forms may need to be filled out and what other procedures may need to be completed in order to obtain information about the student if it is deemed necessary.

B. Review and confirm follow-up intervals

Now that you have determined which groups will be included in your survey, you need to plan the time to make your first contact after the student has left your school. You will also need to decide how many subsequent contacts will be made. Studies show that more contacts and shorter intervals between contacts will increase you chances of tracking down your students and getting the answers to your questions. However, more interviews will also increase your cost.

C. Benefits of collecting baseline data

A baseline survey is important because it can provide you with a list of "completer" students and basic demographic data on these students. Although you can use either school records or a classroom survey, we recommend using both. The data collection instruments recommended for this project include a baseline questionnaire to be administered in the classroom whenever possible and a student school record data collection instrument to be completed by school personnel.

Baseline surveys automatically provide you with a list of student that you can use for your follow-up surveys. Note also that in

any type of follow-up survey, there will be some respondents who are not available at the end of the project period to answer the final set of questions. Consequently, it will be a good idea to collect data from enough students to overcome the loss of respondents two years later. A good practice is to assume hat you will lost 50% of the initial respondents. We propose that a census of graduating seniors be taken for the baseline questionnaire. You can then sample from that baseline census.

Additional data can be collected from the school records of the graduating students. This information will be important for examining the school environment of the students under study. This data can be collected form the school records in the summer after the students have graduated and you have identified the sample members as will be discussed below.

Your baseline procedures will give you information that will otherwise be lost if you do not collect it before the students leave school. You can collect views and information from students while they are still in school. Additionally, baseline surveys will allow you to collect data that you may not be able to get in follow-up interviews. Keep in mind that there are limits to how long respondents will cooperate during follow-up interviews; if you ask questions during baseline survey, it will shorten the time required for your follow-up interviews.

1) Increased student cooperation

If you use a classroom to conduct your baseline survey, you will have a chance to tell students about the follow-up interviews that you need their participation in after they graduate. You can use this time to "sell" the importance of your project. Research suggests that students who have taken baseline surveys are far more likely to cooperate when approached for a follow-up interview.

2) Backup phone and address

You will be able to collect the name, phone and address of a relative or friend who will know how to locate the student if he or she has moved since leaving school. This will save you considerable time and expense during the follow-up survey and it will greatly increase your response rates.

3) Reduce personal confidentiality problems

During baseline survey administration, students and/or their custodians can be asked to sign an agreement to participate in

future data collection efforts. This form is important to get because it establishes a consent to collect future information and to use available information that the school may have to improve the understanding of the students' situation. You can also ask them to sign statements which allow agencies , such as the Department of Rehabilitation, to provide you with their addresses and other information after the students have left school. You will reduce or eliminate confidentiality constraints by getting these forms signed.

4) Reduce cost

Contrary to common impressions, baseline surveys are likely to reduce rather than increase your costs. As noted above, baseline surveys allow you to get the information before you have to pay for telephone or on site interviews. They also reduce the costs of conducting follow-up interviews by encouraging student cooperation, and providing back up phone numbers.

D. Set a timetable for the project

1) Determine termination dates

The date that student graduate or leave school will determine when the baseline survey can be conducted and when the count-down begins between student departure dates and time during their senior year, say two months before graduation, to do your baseline survey.

2) Determine the time between graduation and follow-up interviews

In order to strike a balance between your desire for more information and your need to contain cost, we suggest that you do follow-up contacts at 6 months, 1 year, 18 months and 2 years after graduation.

3) Estimate time requirements for project tasks

Next, you will need to make a preliminary estimate of the time required for key project tasks. Since significant parts of the plan have not yet been completed, you will need to make preliminary estimates of your project schedule. While these estimates may be crude, it is important to establish a rough timetable to insure that key dates for effective project management are not missed.

4) Check timetable to ensure data quality

It is important that there be a reasonably consistent period of time between the dates of graduation and follow-up interviews. After you have started interviewing, it is extremely important that you complete the interviews as rapidly as possible.

If you take too long between the start and completion of interviews, the passage of time can contaminate your data. Assume the first students are interviewed promptly at twenty-four weeks after leaving school, and the last interviews are completed twenty-eight weeks after the completion date. The students that were interviewed last clearly had more time to find a job. This difference of time between program completion and follow-up interviews could produce biased outcome data.

II. IDENTIFY DATA SOURCES

A. Identify post-school system liaisons

It will be important to identify employees in community agencies such as the Department of Rehabilitation, Department of Health and Human Services, County Mental Health, local hospitals and medical facilities. Private social services agencies can also be very helpful. These agencies may be able to help you locate special education students. They may also be an important data source if you get permission from students and/or their custodians while the students are still in school. Employees at these agencies could verify the information that you get from the interviews and they could supply you with other information about your former students. The people at these agencies might also help to provide information about clubs or networks of former special education students in the community. This information can be invaluable in attempting to assess the quality of life and the economic conditions of former special education students.

B. Establish Basic Sampling Goals

For any given year, if you have fewer than 400 in your target population, (e.g., graduating special education students or graduating general education students),(i.e., interview every one of them). If you have 400 or more in your target population, interview a random sample of 400 of them.

Since most schools systems have more than 400 general education students, you will probably want to take a sample of this group. However, many of you at schools that have fewer than 400 special education students will need to take a census of your special education students. It is good practice, when making comparisons between groups, to have about the same size of group membership in both of them. This equality in group size eases the methods of statistical analysis.

III. ASSESS RESOURCE NEEDS AND FINALIZE GOALS

Before committing time and resources to further planning and preparations, it is important to complete this stage to insure that your goals are feasible with the resources you have available.

A. Review goals, organizations and resources

After you get an agreement among your key project staff about your research goals and an assurance of organizational and inter-agency liaison and cooperation, it is important to assess resource needs.

(1) Estimate the number you plan to survey

Resource needs cannot be estimated until you estimate the number of people that you plan to survey. Review this information carefully to estimate the scope of your proposed data collection and develop a framework for assessing project costs. This assessment will require you to outline all the research activities that you plan to conduct over the two year period.

(2) Outline project organization and delegation of responsibilities

You need to give an individual explicit responsibility for coordinating the project. You might consider appointing a larger committee which has representatives from interested groups, e.g., the Department of Rehabilitation, local medical staff, Lions International, to help with backup and contacts. It might be especially important to include members of your local special education advocacy group who are organizationally active. Such groups can provide important support and very useful information about students who have left the high school.

B. Assess costs

If you can calculate an accurate estimate of the average total cost of a complete set of data for one respondent in the proposed project, you have gone a long way towards completing the estimated budget total. The average total cost of an interview can be multiplied times the number of interviews to get a close approximation of the total cost of the project. You will need to estimate average total costs separately for special education and for general eeducation students since there may be significant differences in the cost of collecting data from the two groups. Then you can multiply the average total cost of the special education data collection times the number of expected interviews. You can do the same for the general education students and then add the two amounts together for the estimate of total cost.

Appendix A provides a worksheet for making an initial assessment of resource needs. (This worksheet should be used to develop a quick "ballpark" cost estimateand help isolate some of the key resource needs. It should not be used to prepare a final project budget. You will need to develop a more precise assessment of costs based on local conditions, avvailable resources and your project goals in order to create a final budget.

IV. PREPARE FOR DATA COLLECTION

A. Review and plan data collection methods

The baseline forms are designed to collect information from your students about their satisfaction with life, education, their employment status and their personal background. You will also collect data from student records, such as information about the programs the student had in school and their expected graduation date. This source of information is designed to supplement respondents' baseline questionnaire information.

We propose that a census of all seniors be taken during the spring term of the academic year. This census will include both general education students and special education students.

The census can be done in the following manner. Identify the classrooms, such as a first period room or a home room which will have all seniors in it. Secondly, identify the locations of the classes of all the special education student in the high school system. It is a good idea to take some time with the instructors and review with them the reasons for the survey. Brief them on the content of the questionnaire and the procedures for filling them out.

B. Collect baseline data

If you plan to have instructors administer the questionnaire without your presence in the classroom, it is important to prepare survey packets for each class. This packet should contain quesionnaires for every student plus a few extras. The preliminary classroom or training site information should be pre-entered on each questionnaire. A one page cover sheet should be placed on top of this packet with pre-filled out class identification, date, number of respondents and comments about problems in the administration of the in-class questionnaire. If the survey is to be administered by several instructors, you may want to brief them about procedures at a staff meeting. Finally, be sure to specify arrangements for collecting the completed questionnaire.

(1) Administer survey

Administer the classroom survey. Either you or the survey administrator should check questionnaires in the classroom as they are returned by students. It is important to make sure that the students have fully completed the forms. If questionnaires are incomplete, students can be asked or helped to complete missing responses. If you fail to check returned questionnaires at the survey site, you will have to phone or track students down in class later. Make sure that the number of collected responses is about the same as the number of students "actively enrolled" in the class. This number will be equal to the initial enrollment minus dropouts. If absenteeism is high the day of the survey, your baseline data will be distorted.

(2) Check forms

Go over each of the completed forms and check for errors or missing data that might be cleared up before the students leave high school. This is an important step because it will reduce your likelihood of problems in future data collection activities. If some of the completed forms have missing data, or incoherent responses, clear them up now so that they will not be a problem later.

(3) Avoid double counting

When you take your classroom surveys, there is some risk of collecting data twice from the special education students who are located in the general population classes you surveyed. You can avoid this by instructing the people who administer your surveys to ask any student who has filled out the instrument in another class to return the form before the survey begins.

C. Enter baseline data into a computer

Before entering the data into a computer, you must plan on sampling the completed baseline questionnaires for the follow-up study. It is good practice to asume that there will be at least a 50% loss rate in contact of the graduates over the two year period. We recommend that you decide on how large your final sample should be and then multiply that number by at least 2. The product will give you the number of completed baseline questionnaires that you must enter into the computer. Note that you should have randomly selected the completed baseline questionnaires as directed above.

After you have collected the Baseline and Student Record Information questionnaires and checked them for completion, you can enter data directly from the questionnaires into a computer. But don't throw the completed forms away. You need to keep, at the minimum, an active computer file of the names of respondents and the original completed data collection instruments for about two years after the report has been filed.

D. Organize your follow-up surveys

(1) Plan and arrange survey time, space, and phones

You should make arrangements with administrators to get the space and equipment to conduct the follow-up survey. During the evening hours you might be able to use administrative office space. Make sure that there is an adequate supply of good interviewers, instructions, pencils and erasers.

You will have to manage data collection over five data collection activities. You should plan on using Appendix B to help you keep track of the four follow-up events over the two year period. In this way you can be more efficient in managing this complex task of sampling four times after graduation.

(2) Duplicate call sheets and interviewer directions

It will help to use call sheets when you do your interviewing. Appendix C provides a copy of those forms. It is important to record all phone call activity and outcomes on these call sheets. These become management tools for the data collection activity. There are spaces for four separate calls, the outcome of each call and information about the movement of the respondent to new locations. If your former students have moved out of the local area, you will have to place long-distance calls to reach them. In some cases when the respondent will only be at home at certain times, you will need to schedule an appointment interview. You can use the call sheets to record this type of detailed information. Try to have the appointed call backs set up for the next immediate interviewing session.

E. Train staff

You will need to finalize your timetable, train your staff, and make appointments with those students who require face-to-face interviews to complete this task.

(1) Select, train, and brief interviewers

After you select your interviewers, plan to brief them on why data is being collected, how it will be used and the importance of the follow-up survey.

When you train interviewers, focus on their need to be accurate and consistent when following the directions you give them. Get across the idea that they will be engaged in an important scientific activity; their behaviors during the actual interviewing activity will influence the results of the data collection. It is therefore incumbent on them to ask the questions exactly as they are written, to record the responses as accurately as possible, and to avoid leading the respondent in any way.

Make sure that you emphasize the need for interviewers to fill out the call back sheets carefully. Accurate and timely information on the call and tracking sheets will lead to efficiency in the survey project. Emphasize the need to pay diligent attention to appointment calls. The call back sheets are critical for a high response rate.

During the interviewer training and briefing sessions it is important to cover the procedures for coding the telephone call outcomes. This information is crucial for efficient management of the telephone calling activity.

Appoint one or two persons to be the sole face-to-face household interviewers. They can plan their data collection during the day or at times that will be convenient for the respondent.

Even experienced interviewers need practice with the questionnaire before they begin surveys. Interviewers should be given time to review the questionnaire thoroughly and discuss questions with you. They should also conduct mock interviews among themselves and it is recommended that they do a few trial interviews with former students who are not in the follow-up sample.

During the briefing be sure to explain how you want your interviewers to introduce themselves when they call your former students. The interviewers should be prepared to leave the name and office telephone number of an administrator in the district.

(2) Make appointments for face-to-face interviews

You will need to have the designated interviewers make appointments with those students who require face-to-face interviews at their homes. It is very important that this most expensive element of the data collection be conducted in an efficient manner.

V. CONDUCT FOLLOW-UP DATA

This section contains procedures for each of the four follow-up contacts. The objective of your first contact is to update the addresses and phone numbers of the original students who filled out the baseline questionnaires. The procedures contained in the first set of directions should be followed again during the information system update 18 months after graduation from high school.

A. Make first follow-up contact

About five months after your students have graduated from school you should begin to make your first follow-up contact. The purpose of this contact is to keep a tab on the addresses and phone numbers of your former students and to ask them a couple of employment questions. This step is broken into the following tasks:

(1) Produce mailing labels for each of the students from which you have obtained baseline data.

(2) Prepare a return addressed stamped postcard with a very simple form on the reverse side. Make sure the reverse side of the postcard has three questions on it: change of address or phone number, are you employed and how much do you earn? Request your respondent to fill it out and drop it in the mail.

(3) As the postcards come in, check the changes on the cards with data in the information system. Update the system by making any changes that are necessary and enter the responses to the employment questions.

(4) After a month, begin calling those who have not responded. Consider tracking them to places beyond the local area if you learn that they have left. This can be done either by mail or by phone. Contact those relatives or friends who are named on the initial data collection instruments as additional contacts.

(5) If you cannot contact the person after four attempts, delete that person from the list of persons to be contacted in the future. Keep a list of the people you dropped from your survey and a record of the attempts that you made contact them in case you need to document your efforts.

(6) Make final checks with the data base that you have on these graduates to acknowledge that you have updated the data base with new information or check to see that your current information is correct. Relational data base systems such as Ironbase are excellent for this type of work.

B. Make second follow-up contact

The second task requires you to collect follow-up data about the individual students in both the special education and the general student population groups. It is scheduled one year after graduation. You will collect this data by telephone or by face-to-face interviews. All of your general population students can be interviewed by phone. Most of your special education students or their caregivers/care can be interviewed by phone. You will find procedures for telephone interviews without interpreters, telephone interviews with interpreters and for face-to-face interviews in this section as well as in the script and directions for interviewers.

(1) Conduct telephone interviews without interpreters

(a) Be sure to have enough materials including pencils, call sheets, interviews schedules and interviewer directions sheets. Provide five boxes labeled "In," "Out," "Refusals," "Lost," and "Call back."

(b) Review the major points that you tried to get across in the training session and the questions that you plan to ask.

(c) Begin interviewing. Listen to each of the worker's first interviews to make certain that he or she understands how to follow your directions.

(d) Make sure that your interviewers have a steady stream of respondents to call. Keep the tracking sheets for the students who are to be called in an "In" box. Let your interviewers know that they are free to make notes on these sheets as the need arises.

(e) Have your interviewers start with unused tracking sheets and go through progressive cycles of phoning respondents. If contact is made and an interview completed, the interviewer should mark the tracking sheet as "completed", staple the sheet to the completed questionnaire and place the questionnaire in an "Out" box for completed interviews.

(f) Mark the tracking sheets for unsuccessful contacts, so that they can be dealt with in the future. If the respondent refuses outright, mark the tracking sheet "Refused", and toss it in a box labelled "Refusals."

(g) If you cannot locate a student, label the tracking sheet "Lost", and throw it in a box labelled "Lost."

(h) If efforts to contact the respondent have been indeterminate (i.e., not home, no answers, agreed to be interviewed later, etc.), then you should mark the tracking sheet appropriately and place it in a "Call back" box so that additional efforts can be made.

(i) If your interviewers have made explicit arrangements to phone a respondent at a specific date and time, set aside those tracking sheets at the interviewer's station. Make a note of this arrangement, and make sure that an interviewer calls back at the agreed upon time.

(j) When all the unused tracking sheets have been used, you should move the sheets from the "Call back" box to the first "In" box and start the process again. This process should be repeated three times, or until you have a response rate of at least 70 percent.

(k) Check each questionnaire that your interviewers turn in for accuracy and completeness.

(2) Conduct telephone interviews with interpreters

Use the same procedures described above. However, remember that whenever you use an interpreter, the interviewer should counsel the interpreter to ignore his/her own personal perspectives in the responses. Attempt to obtain the information wanted from the respondent and use the interpreter as a conduit.

(3) Conduct face-to-face interviews

Review the locations of the interviews to be conducted and identify important cross streets. It is important to plan your route so that you can get your interviews with the minimum amount of travel time.

Some modifications in procedures will be necessary. The pacing of the questions may have to be slowed down. There may have to be alterations in the wording of some of the questions in order to make the questions relevant to the person being interviewed. There may have to be repetition of the questions being asked. However, to the extent possible, you should collect the data in much the same way that you collect the data for the rest of the interviews.

Face-to-face interviews of respondents with severe handicaps may require special skills, longer periods of time for the interview and special questionnaire procedures. It is important that these changes be noted on the interview form so that they are more effectively managed. If there are changes in wording, note them on the interview form at the place on the form. Try to make the respondent feel at ease.

C. Make your third follow-up contact

At this point in the research project, you have made two follow-up contacts. Using the information from the second follow-up contact, it will be necessary to update the phone, address and any other relevant information about how to contact the respondents in the future. Recall that this is important because it will improve the efficiency of the survey and it will ensure that the data finally collected are representative of the original graduating group of students. If new information has become available, you may want to revise baseline data as well as address records.

The procedures will be almost identical to those which were described for the first follow-up contact. You will mail each of your respondents a self-addressed and stamped postcard to find out if any of them have new addresses. Since this mail out occurs about 1 and 1/2 years after they have graduated, you will find increased difficulties locating the respondents.

D. Plan and make your fourth follow-up contact

You will make your final contact with the panel study respondents about two years after graduation. The steps are the same as those presented for the second follow-up contact. However, you will need to repeat some of your planning steps as well since it has been two years since you began collecting the baseline study. Then you can repeat the steps from the second contact.

(Release of Information/Confidentallity
letter)

SAMPLE

Dear Parent/Guardian:

The _____School District is conducting a follow-up survey of graduates from 19__. This survey is part of an effort to gain information about each student's employment, education and life satisfaction in order to improve the educational services for future students.

This study will involve compiling information from school records and telephone interviews with each student. All of the information collected will be held strictly confidential and will only be used by those working on the study to prepare statistical summary information. All of the information will be analyzed on a collective basis and no individual or agency will be named.

Please sign and date this letter in the spaces indicated below and return in the self-addressed stamped envelope. Your cooperation and promptness will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

I hereby authorize the _____ School District to access the records of my son/daughter and to use any information about him/her in a statistical report. I understand that all information will be kept strictly confidential.

_____ _____

Signature of Parent/Guardian Date

(to be sent out prior to conducting Baseline survey) SAMPLE

Dear Parent/Guardian:

The _____ School District will be conducting a follow-up study involving a group of students who will complete school in 19 ___. The purpose of this study is to help the school district improve the school experience of future students. All of the information collected during the study will be kept strictly confidential.

Next week, your son/daughter will be asked to complete a survey form in class. We will also be asking him/her to sign a release form so that we can contact other agencies that can provide us with information in the future.

A sample of the graduating class will be randomly selected to participate in the follow-up study. Students involved in this survey will be contacted every six months for the next two years to update their status. The students will be interviewed at the end of the first and second years to answer questions about their employment, education and satisfaction with their lives.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

(to be sent out prior to conducting Baseline survey)

SAMPLE

Dear Student:

You have been selected to represent your school's class of 19__ in a follow-up study of graduates from the _____ School District. The purpose of this study is to learn about our graduates' current activities and how they would evaluate their high school experience. This information is valuable to the district if services are to be geared toward student needs.

You will be asked to complete a simple questionnaire before you graduate. After graduation, you will be contacted several times to answer questions about employment, education and how your life is going.

The first step in this survey process is for you to complete a Baseline form which will give us important information about your goals and views right now. Next week, you will be asked to complete this form and to sign a Release form which will be explained when the Baseline survey is administered.

We appreciate your cooperation with this important study. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

(letter of reminder for
one- or two-year contact)

SAMPLE

Dear Student:

The _____School District will be conducting first and second year follow-up study with the class of 19__. You will be contacted during _____, 19__ by an interviewer from the district. As we explained during your last year of school, the interviewer will be asking questions about your employment status, your education and how your life is going.

All of the information will be kept strictly confidential so that only you and the interviewer will know how you answered the questions. This is important for you to know, because it will allow you to say exactly what you think. You may also refuse to answer questions if you prefer.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

(postcard for six and eighteen month updates)

SAMPLE

Dear Student:

This card contains the information needed by_____ School District to contact you for the follow-up study you agreed to participate in. Please check all of the information and make any changes. Tear off and return the card to us as soon as possible.

Thank you for your cooperation.

----Perforated-----FOLD----------

Student Name:_____

Current Address:_____

_____

Current Phone Number:_____

Are you employed? /___/Yes /___/No

If so, how much do you earn: $_____per hour.

APPENDIX A

WORKSHEETS FOR ESTIMATING COSTS

BASELINE DATA COLLECTION

A. Identify Senior Classes and Identify Special Ed. Students for Census
($_/hr * __hrs) .....$_____

B. Meet with and Brief Regular Classroom Teachers
($_/hr * __hrs) .....$_____

C. Meet with and Brief Special Education Teachers
($_/hr * __hrs) .....$_____

D. Prepare Final Questionnaires, Forms and Packets
($_/hr * __hrs) .....$_____

E. Distribute and Collect Completed Questionnaires
($_/hr * __hrs) .....$_____

F. Materials Costs
Printing
(# pages * # of copies * unit price/page) .....$_____
Travel
(Allowance/mile * # Miles) .....$_____

G. Preparation for Computer Entry
Review of Completed Q's
($_/hr * __hrs) .....$_____

H. Entry into the Computer
($_/hr * __hrs) .....$_____

Subtotal Baseline Data Collection.....$_____

FIRST/THIRD FOLLOW-UP CONTACT
(at 6 months and 18 months)

A. Organize Follow-up Procedures
Finalize Timetable
($_/hr * __/hrs) .....$_____

B. Address and Mail, Track-down
non-contacts
($_/hr * __/hrs) .....$_____

C. Enter Changes in Computer
($_/hr * __/hrs) .....$_____

D. Materials Costs
(Stamps # * per unit price
* # of Interviews) .....$_____
(Printing of Letters,
Envelopes, Postcards *
per unit cost of each * # of
Interviews) .....$_____
(3 minute Telephone Calls
* estimated # of non-contacts
* per unit cost of call) .....$_____
(Travel @ rate per mile *
# of miles) ..... $_____

Subtotal First and Third Follow-up $_____

EXHIBIT 3.5d
WORKSHEET FOR ESTIMATING COST
OF DATA COLLECTION
FOR SECOND/FOURTH FOLLOW-UP
CONTACT

SECOND/FOURTH FOLLOW-UP CONTACT
(at 1 year and 2 years)

A. Organize Follow-up Interview Procedures
($_/hr * __/hrs) .....$_____

B. Select,Train and Brief Interviewers
(Training/briefing Salaries)
($_/hr * __/training & briefing hrs * # of interviewers) .....$_____

C. Interviewer Salaries
($_/hr * # Interviewers * __/hrs .....$_____

D. Materials Costs
Estimated Phone Charges (long distance) Average cost/min * estimated # of minutes .....$_____
Printing Costs
# of pages * # copies * price per unit .....$_____
Travel for Face to Face Interviews (Average number of miles * # of face to face interviews=total mileage;Total mileage * $_/per mile) .....$_____

E. Data Preparation for Computer Error Checking and control
($_/hr * __/hrs) .....$_____

F. Entry into Computer
($_/hr * __/hrs .....$_____

Subtotal Second/Fourth Follow-up Contact .....$_____

APPENDIX B

FOLLOW-UP DATA COLLECTION TRACKING SHEET

Note: this form is designed to help you keep track of the data collection events from the Baseline survey to the final telephone interview. There is a section on this form for each of the contacts.

Respondent's Name

_____

Address:

Street_____

City_____

Zip_____

Study ID #

_____

Phone Number:

_____

Alternate Phone Number:

_____

I. BASELINE & STUDENT RECORDS DATA SHEETS

Date Collected ___/___/___

	circle	
Is there a need for further information?	yes	no
Is the agreement to participate form in the file?	yes	no

Indicate in the space below the nature of the information problem and indicate the steps you have taken to resolve the problem.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

II. FIRST POST HIGH SCHOOL CONTACT EVENT

Date of Mailing:

_____/_____/_____

Status of Response:	Circle	
(1.0)Has the card been returned?	yes	no
(1.1) If "yes" go to (1.7)		
(1.2)If "no" have you called?	yes	no
(1.3)If no do so now!		
(1.4)If "yes" have you made four call backs?	yes	no
(1.5)If "yes" and there is no contact delete the case from the file.		
(1.6)Go to the next case.		
(1.7)Are there changes to be made in the tracking data files?	yes	no
(1.8) If "no" go to the next case.		
(1.9)If "yes" have you entered the changes in the data file?	yes	no
(1.10)If "yes" go to the next case.		
(1.11)If "no" do so now		

[illegible]

Date of Telephone or Face-to-Face Interview

_____/_____/_____

(5.1) Did the interview indicate a need to change the address or phone contact procedures? Circle one: yes no

(5.2) If "yes" have the changes been made in the file? yes no

(5.3) If "no" note the changes now.

(5.4) If "yes" go to the next case.

[illegible]

Date of Meeting

_____/_____/_____

Status of Response

Circle one:

(5.1) Has the card been returned? yes no

(5.1) If "yes" go to 5.5.

(5.2) If "no" have you called? yes no

(5.3) If "yes" have you made four call backs? yes no

(5.4) If "yes" and there is no contact delete the case from the file. Go to the next case.

(5.5) If "yes" are there changes to be made in the existing data file? yes no

(5.6) If "yes" have you attached the changes in the data file? yes no

(5.7) If "no" do so now.

(5.8) If "yes" go to the next case.

[illegible]

[illegible]

Date of Telephone or Face-to-Face Interview

[illegible]

	Circle	
[illegible] the data complete?	yes	no
[illegible] "no" have you called back?	yes	no
[illegible] "no" do so now		
[illegible] "yes" is the data record complete?	yes	no
[illegible] "yes" go to the next record.		
[illegible] "no" resolve by calling back.		

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

TO BE PRINTED ON REVERSE SIDE OF THE PRIOR SHEET

Pre call Outcome

Date	Outcome				
	Hardbone	Wrong #	Rep. not Home	Refused	Completed
xx/xx/xxx	xxxxxxx	xxxxxx	xxxxxx	xxxxxx	xxxxxx
Completed:					

Post call Outcome

Date	Outcome				
	Hardbone	Wrong #	Rep. not Home	Refused	Completed
xx/xx/xxx	xxxxxxx	xxxxxx	xxxxxx	xxxxxx	xxxxxx
Completed:					

SOURCES OF SAMPLE INSTRUMENTS

Akron-Summit County Public Schools
Akron-Summit County Job Placement Department
692 Grant Street
Akron, OH 44311

Alameda County Office of Education
Alameda County Interagency
Transition Coordinating Team
313 West Winton Avenue
Hayward, CA 94544-1198
With: Denise Landreau

Alameda Unified School District
Historic Alameda High School
2200 Central Avenue
Alameda, CA 94501

Bloomsburg State College
Department of Communication Disorders
Bloomsburg, PA 17815
With: Dr. Barry Powers

Capistrano-Laguna Beach
Regional Occupational Program
32502 El Camino Real
San Juan Capistrano, CA 92675
With: Sara Shine

Cassitas Regional Occupational Program
1400 Presidio Square
Santa Rosa, CA 95405-1304
With: Nancy Dowdy

Decision Research
1400 Vista Drive
Santa Barbara, CA 93111
With: Dr. Charles Reiman

Fresno Metropolitan
Regional Occupational Center/Program
11 South Fairlane Street
Fresno, CA 93706
With: Bill Schultz

Grossmont Union High School District
Planning, Research and Development
P.O. Box 1043
La Mesa, CA 92041
With: William Brown

Kern County Regional Occupational Program
1300 "H" Street
Bakersfield, CA 93301
With: Dan McQuillan

Kern High School District
2000 28th Street
Bakersfield, CA 93301
With: Barb Fuller

Long Beach Unified School District
701 Locust Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90813
With: Lewis R. Phillipsen

Los Angeles Unified School District
Research & Evaluation
Survey Unit
P.O. Box 3307
Los Angeles, CA 90051
With: Leo Wertheimer

Manhattan County Schools
Regional Occupational Program
2240 East Dike Road
Union, IA 95482
With: Pat Dare

Merced County
Office of the Merced County
Superintendent of Schools
632 West 13th Street
Merced, CA 95340

Michigan Department of Education
P.O. Box 30008
Lansing, MI 48910

Oakland Unified School District
1025 Second Avenue
Oakland, CA 94606
With: Riley Phillipsen

Ohio State Department of Education
Division of Guidance and Testing
65 South Front Street
Columbus, OH 43215

San Diego County
Regional Occupational Program
San Diego County Office of Education
6401 Linda Vista Road
San Diego, CA 92111-7399
With: Russell McKay

San Diego City Schools
Education Center
Room 3110
4100 Normal Street
San Diego, CA 92103-2682
With: Peter D. Bell

Santa Barbara High School District
4400 Cathedral Oaks Road
Santa Barbara, CA 93103
Attn: Dr. Ingrim

Santa Cruz County Office of Education
809 Bay Avenue, Suite A
Capitola, CA 95010
Attn: Alvin Reese

Santa Cruz Regional Occupational Program
Office of Education
809 Bay Avenue, Suite A
Capitola, CA 95010
Attn: Linda Curtis

Shasta-Trinity Regional Occupational Program
2900 Eastside Road
Redding, CA 96001
Attn: Colleen Williams

State of Florida
Department of Education
PL 08
The Capitol
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Tri-County Regional Occupational Program
Sutter County Schools Office
960 Second Street
Yuba City, CA 95991
Attn: David R. Dennis

University of Colorado
School of Education
Colorado Springs, CO 80907
Attn: Dr. Dennis Whitney

University of Vermont
College of Education and Social Services
Department of Special Education, Social Work,
Social Services
Waterman Building
Burlington, VT 05405-0160
Attn: Dr. Susan Bradley Hasazi

University of Virginia
Rehabilitation, Research and Training Center
2219 West Main Street, Richmond, VA 23220
Attn: Dr. Paul Wehman

Washington University
Networking & Evaluation Team
Experimental Education Unit, J-13
Seattle, WA 98119

Ventura County Regional Occupational Program
Camarillo Airport
Building 180
275 East Pleasant Valley Road
Camarillo, CA 93010
Attn: Judith B. Mason

F-3

REFERENCES

Abel, T. (1960). A study of a group of subnormal girls successfully adjusted in industry in the community. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 65, 66-72.

Baller, W. (1936). A study of the present social status of a group of adults who when they were in elementary school were classified as mentally deficient. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 18, 165-244.

Bellamy, G. (1985). Transition progress: Comments on Hasazi, Gordon, and Roe. Exceptional Children, 51(6), 476-477.

Dubroff, A. (1956). Economic adjustment of 121 adults, formerly students in classes for mental retardates. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 6, 525-535.

Borg, W., Meredith, D., & Gall, M. (1979). Educational Research, (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Longman Publishing, Inc.

Boyce, D., & Elsey, F. (1978). A study of the vocational adequacy of former special education students following high school graduation. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

Brolin, D. (1972). Value of rehabilitation services and correlates of vocational success with the mentally retarded. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 76(6), 644-651.

Brown, L., Bogan, P., Shiraga, B., Zanella Albright, K., Kessler, K., Bryson, F., VanDeventer, P., & Loomis R. (1987). A vocational follow-up evaluation of the 1984-1986 Madison Metropolitan School District Graduates with severe intellectual disabilities. In L. Brown, R. Loomis, K. Zanella Albright, P. Bogan, J. York, B. Shiraga, A. Udvari Solner, & E. Long. Educational programs for students with severe intellectual disabilities, Vol. XVI. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin and Madison Metropolitan School District.

Brown, L., Shiraga, B., Ford, A., Nisbet, J., VanDeventer, P., Sweet, M., York, J., & Loomis, R. (1983). Teaching severely handicapped students to perform meaningful work in non-sheltered vocational environments. In L. Brown, A. Ford, J. Nisbet, M. Sweet, B. Shiraga, J. York, and R. Loomis (Eds.), Educational programs for severely handicapped students, Vol. XIII. (pp. 1-100). Madison, WI: Madison Metropolitan School District.

83

Burton, L. (1981). The opinions of teachers of the deaf-blind toward the appropriateness of timeout. Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama.

Burton, L., LeRoy, C., Schultz, A., & Wojciehowski, T. (in process) Sample outcomes of special education: Analysis and case studies. Journal of the Association of Persons with Severe Handicaps.

Butler, A., & Browning, P. (1970). Methodological issues in the prediction of rehabilitation outcomes with the mentally retarded. In H.J. Prehm (Ed.). Rehabilitation research in Mental Retardation. (Monograph No. 2) Rehabilitation Research and Training Center in Mental Retardation. (pp. 49-69) Eugene, OR: University of Oregon.

Carraker, W. (1957). A comparison of post-school adjustment of regular and special class retarded individuals served in Lincoln and Omaha, Nebraska public schools. (Contract No. SAE-6445.) Department of Health, Education and Welfare, U.S. Office of Education.

Cassidy, V. & Phelps, H. (1955). Post-school adjustment of slow learning children. Columbus, OH: Bureau of Special and Adult Education, The Ohio State University.

Chaffin, J., Spellman, C., Regan, C., & Davidson, R. (1971). Two follow-up studies of former educable mentally retarded students from the Kansas Work-Study Project. Exceptional Children, 37, 733-738.

Cloninger, L. (1976). Our work-study product: Does it stand up? Paper presented at Annual International Convention, Council for Exceptional Children, Chicago, IL (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 122531).

Coakley, F. (1945). Study of feeble-minded wards employed in war industries. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 50, 301-306.

Cobb, H. (1972). The forecast of fulfillment: A review of research on predictive assessment of the adult retarded for social and vocational adjustment. New York: Teachers College Press.

Collmann, R., & Newlyn, D. (1956). Employment success of educationally sub-normal ex-pupils in England. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 60, 733-743.

Cook, D. (1983). Post-school adjustment of former rehabilitation center clients: A longitudinal analysis. Rehabilitation Literature, 44(7-8), 194-200.

Cook, J. (1976). Follow-up study of the visually impaired. Monograph No. 5: Program accountability in special education. Madison, WI: Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction. (Sponsoring Agency: Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, [DHEW/DE] Washington, D.C.). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 176484).

Crain, E. (1980). Socioeconomic status of educable mentally retarded graduate of special education. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 15(2), 90-94.

Delph, H., & Lorenz, M. (1953). Follow-up of 84 public school special class pupilsw with I.Q.'s below 50. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 58, 175-182.

Dinger, J. (1961). Post school adjustment of former educable retarded pupils. Exceptional Children, 27, 353-360.

Edgar, E. (1985). How do special education students fare after they leave school? A response to Hasazi, Gordon, and Roe. Exceptional Children, 51(6), 470-473.

Edgar, E., & Levine, P. (1986). Washington state follow-up studies of post-secondary special education students in transition. Unpublished manuscript, Child Development and Mental Retardation Center, University of Washington, Seattle.

Edgar, E., & Levine, P. (1987) Special education in transition: Washington State Data 1976-1986. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Experimental Education Unit.

Edgerton, R., & Bercovici, S. (1976). The cloak of competence: Years later. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 80(5), 485-497.

Edgerton, R. (1967). The cloak of competence: Stigman in the lives of the mentally retarded. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Evea, L. & Crichton, J. (1974-1975). A five-year follow-up of children with minimal brain dysfunction. Academic Therapy, 10, 173-180.

Fafard, M., & Haubrich, P. (1981). Vocational and social adjustment of learning disabled young adults: A follow-up study. Learning Disability Quarterly, 4, 122-130.

Fairbanks, R. (1933) The subnormal child - seventeen years later. Mental Hygiene, 17, 177-208.

Fardig, D., Algozzini, R., Schwartz, S., Hensel, J. & Westling, D. (1985). Post-secondary vocational adjustment of rural, mildly handicapped students. Exceptional Children, 52(2), 115-121.

Cook, J. (1976). Follow-up study of the visually impaired. Monograph No. 5: Program accountability in special education. Madison, WI: Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction. (Sponsoring Agency: Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, [DHEW/DE] Washington, D.C.). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 176484).

Crain, E. (1980). Socioeconomic status of educable mentally retarded graduate of special education. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 15(2), 90-94.

Delph, H., & Lorenz, M. (1953). Follow-up of 84 public school special class pupilsw with I.Q.'s below 50. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 58, 175-182.

Dinger, J. (1961). Post school adjustment of former educable retarded pupils. Exceptional Children, 27, 353-360.

Edgar, E. (1985). How do special education students fare after they leave school? A response to Hasazi, Gordon, and Roe. Exceptional Children, 51(6), 470-473.

Edgar, E., & Levine, P. (1986). Washington state follow-up studies of post-secondary special education students in transition. Unpublished manuscript, Child Development and Mental Retardation Center, University of Washington, Seattle.

Edgar, E., & Levine, P. (1987) Special education in transition: Washington State Data 1976-1986. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Experimental Education Unit.

Edgerton, R., & Bercovici, S. (1976). The cloak of competence: Years later. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 80(5), 485-497.

Edgerton, R. (1967). The cloak of competence: Stigman in the lives of the mentally retarded. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Eves, L. & Crichton, J. (1974-1975). A five-year follow-up of children with minimal brain dysfunction. Academic Therapy, 10, 173-180.

Fafard, M., & Haubrich, P. (1981). Vocational and social adjustment of learning disabled young adults: A follow-up study. Learning Disability Quarterly, 4, 122-130.

Fairbanks, R. (1933) The subnormal child - seventeen years later. Mental Hygiene, 17. 177-208.

Fardig, D., Algozzini, R., Schwartz, S., Hensel, J. & Westling, D. (1985). Post-secondary vocational adjustment of rural, mildly handicapped students. Exceptional Children, 52(2), 115-121.

Fergerson, T., & Kerr, A. (1958). After-histories of boys educated in special schools for mentally handicapped children. Glascow Medical Journal, 36, 50-56.

Fergerson, T., & Kerr, A. (1955). After-histories of girls educated in special schools for mentally handicapped children. Scottish Medical Journal 3, 31-38.

Garvey, M., & Gordon, N. (1973). A follow-up study of children with disorders of speech development. British Journal of Disorders of Communication, 8, 17-28.

Gay. (1987). Competencies for Analysis and Applications, Columbus, OH: Merrill Publishing Company.

Gibson, D. & Fields, D. (1983). Fifty years of institutional habilitation outcomes: Inventory and implications. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 18, 82-89.

Gill, D. (1984). An employment related follow-up of former special education students in Pierce County, Washington. Tacoma, WA: Pierce County Educational Service District 121. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 250854).

Gozali, J. (1972). Perceptions of the EMR special class by forner students. Mental Retardation, 10, 34-35.

Griffiths, C. (1969). A follow-up study of children with disorders of speech. British Journal of Disorders of Communication, 4, 46-47.

Hall, P., & Tomblin, J. (1978). A follow-up study of children with articulation and language disorders. Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 43, 227-241.

Halpern, A. (1973). General unemployment and vocational opportunities for EMR individuals. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 78(2), 123-127.

Hasazi, S., Gordon, L., & Roe, C. (1985). Factors associated with the employment status of handicapped youth exiting high school from 1979 to 1983. Exceptional Children, 51(6), 455-469.

Haskell, R., & Strauss, A. (1943). One hundred institutionalized mental defectives in the armed forces. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 48, 67-71.

Hawkins, J. (1984). Follow-up study of special education graduates, Class of 1983. Rockville, MD: Montgomery County Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 256786).

Hegge, T. (1944). The occupational status of higher grade mental defectives in the present emergency. A study of parolees from Wayne County Training School at Northville, Michigan. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 49, 86-98.

Holman, P. (1933). Following up the special school child. Mental Welfare, 14, 83-88.

Horn, W., O'Donnell, J., & Vitulano, L. (1983). Long term follow-up studies of learning disabled persons. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 9, 542-555.

Howe, C. (1967). Former educable retarded pupils. Exceptional Children, 27, 353-360.

Issac, S., & Michael, W. (1985). Handbook in Research and Evaluation, (2nd ed.), San Diego, CA: Edits Publishing.

Jackson, R., & Rathway, J. (1961). A comparative study of mailed questionnaire and the interview in follow-up studies. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 39, 569-571.

Kennedy, R. (1962). A Connecticut community revisited: A study of the social adjustment of a group of mentally deficient adults in 1948 and 1960. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Kennedy, R. (1948). The social adjustment of morons in a Connecticut city. Wilport, CT: Commissions to Study Resources in Connecticut.

Keys, N., & Nathan, J. (1932). Occupations for the mental handicapped. Journal of Applied Psychology, 16, 497-511.

Kinder, E., Chase, A., & Buck, E. (1941). Data secured during a follow-up study of girls discharged from supervised parole from Letchworth Village. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 45, 572-578.

Leach, L. & Harmon, A. (1986). Annotated bibliography on transition from school to work, Vol. I. Champaign, IL: Transition Institute at Illinois.

Levine, P., Allen, L., & Wysoki, K. The follow-up study: An annotated bibliography. In: Edgar, E., & Levine, P. Special Education Students in Transition: Washington State Data 1976-1986. (pp. 183-217) Seattle, WA: University of Washington Experimental Education Unit.

Little, A., & Johnson, B. (1946). A study of the social and economic adjustments of 113 discharged parolees from Larconia State School. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 50, 437-445.

Lord, A. (1933). A survey of 49 special class pupils. Journal of Education Research, 27, 108-114.

Mahoney, D. (1976). A review of jobs undertaken by the mentally retarded. Australian Journal of Mental Retardation, 4, 24-27.

Mathews, M. (1919). One hundred institutionally trained male defectives in the community under supervision. Mental Hygiene, 6, 332-342.

McFall, T. (1966). Post-school adjustment: A survey of fifty former students of classes for the educable mentally retarded. Exceptional Children, 32, 633-634.

McIntosh, W., (1949). Follow-up study of one thousand non-academic boys. Journal of Exceptional Children, 15, 166-170.

Mithaug, D., & Horiuchi, C. (1983). Colorado statewide follow-up survey of special education students and appendices. Denver, CO: Colorado State Department of Education: Colorado Springs: University of Colorado, School of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 250902).

Mithaug, D., Horiuchi, C., & Fanning, P. (1985). A report on the Colorado statewide follow-up survey of special education students. Exceptional Children, 51, 397-404.

Mullen, F. (1952). Mentally retarded youth find jobs. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 31, 20-25.

Okolo, C., & Sitlington, P. (1986). The role of special education in LD adolescents' transition from school to work. Learning Disability Quarterly, 9, 141-155.

Olshansky, S., & Beach, D. (1975). A five-year follow-up of physically disabled clients. Rehabilitation Literature, 36(8), 251-258.

Owens, J., & Stocking, C. (1985). High school and beyond: A longitudinal study for the 1980's. Characteristics of high school students who identify themselves as handicapped. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics.

Peterson, L., & Smith, L. (1960). The post-school adjustment of educable mentally retarded adults with that of adults of normal intelligence. Exceptional Children, 26, 404-408.

Powers, G., & Lewis, J. (1976). 1970-1975 follow-up of hearing impaired graduates of Pennsylvania. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania State Department of Education.

Quincy, M. (1982). The "after 22" survey. Massachusetts Department of Education: Division of Special Education. (Survey Report #1: Statewide Survey).

Rader, B., Shapiro, H., & Rodin, A. (1978). On placement of multiply handicapped clients into the open job market. Rehabilitation Literature, 39(10), 299-302.

Reich, C. (1973). Vocational specialization and occupational placement: A follow-up study. Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 21, 281-287.

Richardson, N., & Krieger, N. (1976). An evaluation of vocational placement success at a comprehensive rehabilitation center. Rehabilitation Literature, 37(8), 237-241.

Ross, R. Begab, M., Dondis, E., Giampiccolo, J., & Meyers, E. (1985). Lives of the Mentally Retarded: A Forty Year Follow-Up. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Rusch, F. & Phelps, L. (1987). Secondary special education and transition from school to work: A national priority. Exceptional Children, 53(6), 487-492.

Saenger, G. (1957). The adjustment of severely retarded adults in the community. Albany, NY: Interdepartmental Health Resource Board.

Shalock, R., Wolzen, B., Ross, I., Elliott, B., Werbel, G. & Peterson, K. (1986). Post-secondary community placement of handicapped individuals: A five year follow-up analysis. Learning Disability Quarterly.

Shannyfelt, P. (1974). Occupational preparation of secondary educable students. Pointer, 19, 106-110.

Sher, J. (1978). A proposal to end federal neglect of rural schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 60, 280-282.

Sigelman, C., Schoenrock, C., Spankel, C., Hromas, S., Winer, J., Budd, E., Martin, P. (1980). Surveying mentally retarded persons: Responsiveness and response validity in three samples. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 84(5), 479-486.

Skaabrevik, K. (1971). A follow-up study of educable mentally retarded in Norway. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 75, 560-565.

Smith, H. (1975). Strategies of Social Research, (2nd Edition), Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Stanfield, J. (1973). Graduation: What happens to the retarded child when he grows up? Exceptional Children, 39, 548-553.

Strickland, C. & Arrell, V. (1967). Employment of the mentally retarded. Exceptional Children, 34, 21-24.

Titus, R. & Travis, J. (1973). Follow-up of EMR program graduates. Mental Retardation, 11, 24-26.

Tobias, J. (1970). Vocational adjustment of young retarded adults. Mental Retardation, 8, 13-16.

Vogel, H. (1975). A follow-up of former student/patients at the Crippled Children's Hospital and School, Sioux Falls, South Dakota. Rehabilitation Literature, 36(9), 270-273.

Walsh, W. (1968). Validity of self report - another look. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 15, 180-186.

Wehman, P., Hill, M., Hill, J., Brooke, V., Pendleton, P., & Britt, C. (1985). Competitive employment for persons with mental retardation: A follow-up six years later. Mental Retardation, 23(6), 274-281.

Wehman, P., Kregel, J., & Seyfarth, J. (1985). Employment outlook for young adults with mental retardation. Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, December, 90-99.

Weiner, P. (1972). The perceptual level of functioning of dysphasic children: A follow-up study. Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 15, 423-438.

Whitcomb, M. (1945). A comparison of social and intellectual levels of 100 high-grade adult mental defectives. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 50, 257-262.

White, W., Alley, G., Deshler, D. Schumaker, J., Warner, M., & Clark, F. (1982). Are there learning disabilities after high school? Exceptional Children, 49, 273-274.

Will, M. (1983). OSERS programming for the transition of youth with disabilities: Bridges from school to working life. Washington, D.C.: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 256132).

Wilton, K., & Cosson, L. (1977). Employment and adjustment of special education graduates in a New Zealand city. Australian Journal of Mental Retardation, 4(5), 3-7.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbaey, D., Bernhardt, M., Horvath, L., Luskin, B., May, B., McGraw, K., Rizzo, D., & Sutton, M. (1983). Special education evaluation: A follow-up study of Staples High School students served by programs for the emotionally handicapped in the class of 1980. Westport, WA: Westport Public Schools.

Abbott, R., & Frank, B. (1975) A follow-up of LD children in a private special school. Academic Therapy, 10, 291-298.

Abel, T. (1940). A study of a group of subnormal girls successfully adjusted in industry and the community. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 45, 66-72.

Ackerman, P., Dykman, R., & Peters, J. (1977). Learning-disabled boys as adolescents: Cognitive factors and achievement. Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry, 16, 296-313(b).

Aram, D., Ekelman, B., & Nation, J. (1984). Preschoolers with language disorders 10 years later. Journal of Speech and Hearing, 27, 232-244.

Aram, D., Nation, J., & Wolpaw, T. (1979). Developmental language disorders: A follow-up study. The Illinois Speech and Hearing Journal, 12, 14-18.

Babroff, A. (1955). Economic adjustment of 121 adults, formerly students in classes for mental retardates. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 60, 525-535.

Badham, J. (1955). The outside employment of hospitalized mentally defective patients as a step towards resocialization. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 59, 666-680.

Baller, W., Charles, D., & Miller, E. (1967). Mid-life attainment of the mentally retarded: A longitudinal study. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 75, 235-329.

Baller, W. (1936). A study of the present social status of a group of adults who when they were in elementary schools were classified as mentally deficient. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 18, 165-244.

Balow, B. (1965). The long-term effect of remedial reading instruction. The Reading Teacher, 9, 581-586.

Balow, B., & Bloomquist, M. (1965) Young adults ten to fifteen years after severe reading disability. Elementary School Journal, 66, 44-48.

Behrns, C. (Ed.) (1970). A survey of the employment histories of recent graduates of Pacific School. Seattle, WA.

Bellamy, G. (1985). Transition progress: Comments on Hasazi, Gordon and Roe, Exceptional Children, 51(6), 474-477.

Bickel, W. & Bickel, D. (1986). Effective schools, classrooms, and instruction: Implications for special education. Exceptional Children, 52(6), 489-500.

Bijou, S., Ainsworth, M. & Stockey, M. (1943). The social adjustment mentally retarded girls paroled from the Wayne County Training School. American Journal of Mental Deficiency.

Blessing, K. (1972). An eleven-year follow-up of adult former students of Wisconsin public school classes for the trainable mentally retarded. (Monograph No. 1). Madison: Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction, Division for Handicapped Children. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No 101508).

Bluestein, V. (1968). Long-term effectiveness of remediation. Journal of School Psychology, 6, 130-135.

Bobroff, A. (1956). Economic adjustment of 121 adults, formerly students in classes for mental retardates. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 6, 525.

Borg, W., Meredith, D. & Gall, M. (1979). Educational Research, (3rd ed.), New York, NY: Longman Publishing, Inc.

Boyce, D., & Elzsey, F. (1978). A study of the vocational adequacy of former special education students following high school graduation. San Francisco, CA: San Francisco Unified School District.

Brolin, D., Durand, R., Kromer, K., & Muller, P. (1975). Postschool adjustment of educable retarded students. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 10, 144-149.

Brolin, D. (1972). Value of rehabilitation services and correlates of vocational success with the mentally retarded. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 76(6), 644-651.

Bronner, A. (1933). Follow-up studies of mental defectives. Proceedings and Addresses of the American Association for the Study of the Feebleminded, 38, 258-264.

Brown, L., Pumpian, I., Baumgart, D., VanDeventer, P., Ford, A., Nisbet, J., Schroeder, J., & Gruenewald, L. (1981). Longitudinal transition plans in programs for severely handicapped students. Exceptional Children, 47, 624-631.

Brown, L., Rogan, P., Shiraga, B., Zanella Albright, K., Kessler, K., Bryson, F., VanDeventer, P., & Loomis, R. (1987). A vocational follow-up evaluation of the 1984-1986 Madison Metropolitan School District graduates with severe intellectual disabilities. In L. Brown, R. Loomis, K. Zanella Albright, P. Rogan, J. York, B. Shiraga, A. Udvari Solner & E. Long. Educational programs for students with severe intellectual disabilities, Vol. XVI. Madison, WI: Madison Metropolitan School District.

Brown, L., Shiraga, B., Ford, A., Nisbet, J., VanDeventer, P., Sweet, M., York, J., & Loomis, R. (1983). Teaching severely handicapped students to perform meaningful work in non-sheltered vocational environments. In L. Brown, A. Ford, J. Nisbet, M. Sweet, B. Shiraga, J. York, and R. Loomis (Eds.), Educational programs for severely handicapped students, Vol. XIII. (pp. 1-100). Madison, WI: Madison Metropolitan School District.

Buckley, J., & Bellamy, G. (1986). National survey of day and vocational programs for adults with severe disabilities: A 1984 profile. Unpublished manuscript.

Burton, L. (1981). The opinions of teachers of the deaf-blind toward the appropriateness of timeout. Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama.

Burton, L., and Wojciehowski, T. (1986). Current and Future Trends in Transition Training, Division for the Visually Handicapped Quarterly, 30(4), June, 1986.

Burton, L., Chavez, J., & Wojciehowski, T., "Career Education for the Employers' Viewpoint", ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children (ED 267552) September. Abstracted in Resources in Education (EC 182072) August, and Exceptional Child Education Resources.

Burton, L., LeRoy, C., Schultz, A., & Wojciehowski, T. (in process) Sample outcomes of special education: Analysis and case studies. Journal of the association of Persons with Severe Handicapps.

Butler, A., & Browning, P. (1970). Methodological issues in the prediction of rehabilitation outcomes with the mentally retarded. In H.J. Prehm (Ed.). Rehabilitation research in Mental Retardation. (Monography No. 2) Rehabilitation Research and Training Center in Mental Retardation. (pp. 49-69) Eugene, OR: University of Oregon.

Carraker, W. (1957). A comparison of post-school adjustment of regular and special class retarded individuals served in Lincoln and Omaha, Nebraska public schools. (Contract No. SAE-6445.) Department of Health, Education and Welfare, U.S. Office of Education.

Cassidy, V. & Phelps, H. (1955). Post-school adjustment of slow learning children. Columbus, OH: Bureau of Special and Adult Education, The Ohio State University.

Cerny, L. (1976). Experience in the re-education of children with dyslexia in Czechoslavakia. International Journal of Mental Health, 4, 113-122.

Chaffin, J., Spellman, C., Regen, C., & Davison, R. (1971). Two follow-up studies of former educable mentally retarded students from the Kansas work-study project. Exceptional Children, 37, 733-738.

Channing, A. (1932). Employment of mentally deficient boys and girls. (United States Children's Bureau. Publication No. 210). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Charles, D. (1953). Ability and accomplishment of persons earlier judged mentally deficient. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 47, 3-71.

Clark, G. & Knowlton, H. (1987). From school to adult living: A forum on issues and trends. Exceptional Children, 53(6), 546-554.

Cloninger, L. (1976). Our work-study product: Does it stand up? Paper presented at Annual International Convention, Council for Exceptional Children, Chicago, IL (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 122531).

Coakley, F. (1945). Study of feeble-minded wards employed in war industries. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 50, 301-306.

Cobb, H. (1972). The forecast of fulfillment: A review of research on predictive assessment of the adult retarded for social and vocational adjustment. New York: Teachers College Press.

Collmann, R., & Newlyn, D. (1956). Employment success of educationally sub-normal ex-pupils in England. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 60, 733-43.

Cook, D. (1983). Post-school adjustment of former rehabilitation center clients: A longitudinal analysis. Rehabilitation Literature, 44(7-8), 194-200.

Cook, J. (1976). Follow-up study of the visually impaired. Monograph No. 5: Program accountability in special education. Madison, WI: Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction. (Sponsoring Agency: Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, [DHEW/DE] Washington, D.C.). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 176484).

Cordoni, B. (1982). Postsecondary Education: Where do we go from here? Journal of Learning Disabilities, 15(5), 265-266.

Crain, E. (1980) Socioeconomic status of educable mentally retarded graduate of special education. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 15(2), 90-94.

Dearborn Public Schools, Michigan. (1970). A follow-up comparison of graduates from two types of high school programs for the mentally handicapped: Final report. Washington, D.C.: Department of HEW, Office of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 052551).

Delph, H., & Lorenz, M. (1953). Follow-up of 84 public school special class pupils with I.Q.'s below 50. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 58, 175-182.

Dinger, J. (1958). Postschool adjustment of former special education pupils with implications for curricular revision. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, State College, PA.

Dinger, J. (1961). Post school adjustment of former educable retarded pupils. Exceptional Children, 27, 353-360.

Donder, D., Kowalski, S.A., Clark, N., & Conley, C. (1985). Employment follow-up of special education graduates. Unpublished manuscript.

Eaves, L., & Crichton, J. (1974-75). A five-year follow-up of children with minimal brain dysfunction. Academic Therapy, 10, 173-180.

Ebeling, J. (1986) Background papers for the labor supply survey kit project: Issues and options for developing local data on labor supply from education and training programs. Pacific Management and Research Associates; Sacramento, CA.

Edgar, E. (1985). How do special education students fare after they leave school? A response to Hasazi, Gordon and Roe. Exceptional Children, 51(6), 470-473.

Edgar, E., & Hayden, A. (1985). Who are the children special education should serve and how many children are there? Journal of Special Education, 18, 523-539.

Edgar, E. & Levine, P. (1986). Washington state follow-up studies of post-secondary special education students in transition. Unpublished manuscript, Child Development and Mental Retardation Center, University of Washington, Seattle.

Edgar, E., & Levine, P. (1987) Special education in transition: Washington State Data 1976-1986. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Experimental Education Unit.

Edgerton, R. (1967). The cloak of competence: Stigma in the lives of the mentally retarded. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Edgerton, R., & Bercovici, S. (1976). The cloak of competence: Years later. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 80(5), 485-497.

Edgington, R. (1975). SLD children: A ten year follow-up. Academic Therapy, 11(1), 53-64.

Eves, L. & Crichton, J. (1974-1975). A five-year follow-up of children with minimal brain dysfunction. Academic Therapy, 10, 173-180.

Fafard, M., Haubrich, P. (1981). Vocational and social adjustment of learning disabled young adults: A follow-up study. Learning Disability Quarterly, 4, 122-130.

Fairbanks, R. (1933). The subnormal child - seventeen years after. Mental Hygiene, 17, 177-208.

Fardig, D., Algozzini, R., Schwartz, S., Hensel, J. & Westling, D. (1985). Post-secondary vocational adjustment of rural, mildly handicapped students. Exceptional Children, 52(2), 115-121.

Ferguson, T., & Kerr, A. (1955). After-histories of girls educated in special schools for mentally handicapped children. Scottish Medical Journal, 3, 31-38.

Ferguson, T., & Kerr, A. (1958). After-histories of boys educated in special schools for mentally handicapped children. Glasgow Medical Journal, 36, 50-56.

Fernald, W. (1919). After-care of the patients discharged from Waverly for a period of 25 years. Ungraded, 5, 25-31.

Foley, R. (1929). A study of the patients discharged from the Rome State School for the twenty-year period ending December 31, 1924. Proceedings & Addresses of the American Association for the Study of the Feebleminded, 34, 180-204.

Frauenheim, J. (1978). Academic achievement characteristics of adult males who were diagnosed as dyslexic in childhood. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 11, 476-483.

Garvey, M., & Gordon, N. (1973). A follow-up study of children with disorders of speech development. British Journal of Disorders of Communication, 8, 17-28.

Gay. (1987). Competencies for Analysis and Applications, Columbus, OH: Merrill Publishing Company.

Gibson, D. & Fields, D. (1983). Fifty years of institutional habilitation outcomes: Inventory and implications. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 18, 82-89.

Gill, D. (1984). An employment related follow-up of former special education students in Pierce County, Washington. Tacoma, WA: Pierce County Educational Service District 121. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 250854).

Gillet, P. (1980). Career education in the special elementary education program. Teaching Exceptional Children, Fall, 17-21.

Gottesman, R., Belmont,I., & Kaminer, R. (1975). Admission and follow-up of status of reading disabled children referred to a medical clinic. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 8, 642-650.

Gozali, J. (1972). Perception of the EMR special class by former students. Mental Retardation, 10, 34-35.

Griffiths, C. (1969). A follow-up study of children with disorders of speech. British Journal of Disorders of Communication, 4, 46-47.

Hall, P., & Tomblin, J. (1978). A follow-up study of children with articulation and language disorders. Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders. 43, 227-241.

Halpern, A. (1985) Transition: A look at the foundations. Exceptional Children, 51(6), 479-486.

Halpern, A. (1973). General unemployment and vocational opportunities for EMR individuals. American Journal of Mental Deficiency. 78(2), 123-127.

Harms, M. (1949). Casework in the social adjustment of adult defectives. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 54, 237-243.

Hasazi, S., Gordon, L. & Roe, C. (1985). Factors associated with the employment status of handicapped youth exiting high school from 1979 to 1983. Exceptional Children, 51(6), 455-469.

Hasazi, S., Gordon, L., Roe, C., Finck, K., Hull, M., & Salembier, G. (1985). A statewide follow-up on post high school employment and residential status of students labeled, "mentally retarded." Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, Dec., 222-234.

Halpern, A., Browning, P., & Brummer, E. (1975) Vocational Adjustment of the Mentally Retarded. In Begab, M. & Richardson, S. (Eds.) The Mentally Retarded and Society: A Social Science Perspective, (pp. 365-376). Baltimore, MD; University Park Press.

Hansen, C., Edgar, E., Levine, P., & McConnell, J. (1982). Postschool Follow-up.

Haskell, R., & Strauss, A. (1943). One hundred institutionalized mental defectives in the armed forces. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 48, 67-71.

Hawkins, J., (1984). Follow-up study of special education graduates, class of 1983. Rockville, MD: Montgomery County Public Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No., 256786).

Hegge, T. (1944). The occupational status of higher grade mental defectives in the present emergency. A study of parolees from the Wayne County Training School at Northville, Michigan. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 49, 86-98.

Herjanic, B. & Penick, E. (1972). Adult outcomes of disabled child readers. Journal of Special Education, 6, 397-400.

Hill, M., & Wehman, P. (1983). Cost benefit analysis of placing moderately and severely handicapped individuals into competitive employment. TASH Journal, 8, 30-38.

Hinton, C., & Knights, R. (1971). Children with learning problems: Academic history, academic prediction, and adjustment three years after assessment. Exceptional Children, 37, 513-519.

Holman, P. (1933). Following-up the special school child. Mental Welfare, 14, 83-88.

Horn, W., O'Donnell, J., & Vitualno, L. (1983). Long-term follow-up studies of learning-disabled persons. Journal of Learning Disabilities. 9, 542-555.

Howe, C. (1967). Former educable retarded pupils. Exceptional Children, 27, 353-360.

Issac, S., & Michael, W. (1985). Handbook in Research and Evaluation, (2nd ed.), San Diego, CA: Edits Publishing.

Jackson, R., & Rathway, J. (1961). A comparative study of mailed questionnaire and the interview in follow-up studies. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 39, 569-571.

Jacobson, J., & Janicki, M. (1985). Functional & health status characteristics of persons with severe handicaps in New York state. Journal of the Association of Persons with Severe Handicaps, 10(1), 51-60.

Jewell, A. (1941). A follow-up study of 190 mentally deficient children excluded because of low mentality from the public schools of the District of Columbia, Divisions I-IX, September, 1929 to February 1, 1940. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 413-420.

Keim, R., Rak, C., & Fell, G. (1983). A career awareness program for handicapped students. The Education Digest, January, 57-60.

Kennedy, R. (1962). A Connecticut community revisited: A study of the social adjustment of a group of mentally deficient adults in 1948 and 1960. Hartford, CT: Connecticut State Department of Mental Health, Office of Mental Retardation.

Kemp, E. (1976). Survey of Philadelphia High School Dropouts. 1974-1975. Philadelphia, PA: Philadelphia School District. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 132695).

Kephart, N., & Ainsworth, M. (1938). A preliminary report of community adjustment of parolees of Wayne County Training School. American Association of Mental Deficiency, 43, 161-166.

Kerman, C. (1979). A follow-up study of students placed in educable mentally retarded classes who graduated from programs in Northwest Bergen Council for Special Education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, New Brunswick.

Keys, N., & Nathan, J. (1932). Occupations for the mentally handicapped. Journal of Applied Psychology, 16, 497-511.

Kinder, E., Chase, A., & Buck, E. (1941). Data secured during a follow-up study of girls discharged from supervised parole from Letchworth Village. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 45, 572-578.

Kline, C., & Kline, C. (1975). Follow-up study of 216 dyslexic children. Bulletin of the Orton Society, 25, 127-144.

Koppitz, E. (1972). Supervised living in the community and residential and employment stability of retarded male juveniles. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 77(3), 273-290.

Koppitz, E. (1976). Special class pupils with learning disabilities: A five-year follow-up study. School Psychology Digest, 5, 45-51.

Kraus, J. (1972). Supervised living in the community and residential and employment stability of retarded male juveniles. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 77, 283-290.

Krishef, C., & Hall, M. (1955). Employment of the mentally retarded in Hennepin County, Minnesota. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 60, 182-189.

Leach, L. & Harmon, A. (1986). Annotated bibliography on transition from school to work, Vol. I. Champaign, IL: Transition Institute at Illinois.

Leone, P. (in press) (1986). A descriptive follow-up of behaviorally disordered adolescents. Programming for Adolescents with Behavior Disorders.

Levine, P., Allen, L., & Wysoki, K. The follow-up study: An annotated bibliography. In: Edgar, E., and Levine, P. Special Education Students in Transition: Washington State Data 1976-1986. (pp. 183-217) Seattle, WA: University of Washington Experimental Education Unit.

Little, A. & Johnson, B. (1946). A study of the social and economic adjustments of 113 discharged parolees from Larconia State School. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 50, 437-445.

Lord, A. (1933). A survey of 49 special class pupils. Journal of Education Research, 27, 108-114.

Lurie, L., Schulan, L., & Freiburg, M. (1932). A critical analysis of the progress of 55 feeble-minded children over a period of eight years - two surveys. American Journal of Ortho-Psychiatry, 2, 58-69.

Mahoney, D. (1976). A review of jobs undertaken by the mentally retarded. Australian Journal of Mental Retardation, 4, 24-27.

Malmanger, C. (1982). Woodside graduate follow-up. Seattle, WA: Woodside School.

Massachusetts Department of Special Education, the Division of Special Education. (1982). The after 22 survey: Massachusetts statewide survey of students who are likely to have continuing need for services and/or program provisions from one or more human service agencies after age 22 years. Boston, MA.

Mathews, M. (1919). One hundred institutionally trained male defectives in the community under supervision. Mental Hygiene, 6, 332-342.

McAndrew, I. (1979) A study of school leavers with a physical disability. Yooralla, Australia: Yooralla Society of Victoria (Australia Department of Research and Development)(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 212095).

McFall, T. (1966). Postschool adjustment: A survey of fifty former students of classes for the educable mentally retarded. Exceptional Children, 32, 633-634.

McIntosh, W. (1949). Follow-up study of one thousand non-academic boys. Journal of Exceptional Children, 15, 166-170.

Miller, E. (1965). Ability and social adjustment of persons earlier judged mentally deficient. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 72, 139-198.

Minscoff, E., Sautter, S., Hoffman, F., & Hawks, R. (1987). Employer attitudes toward the hiring of the learning disabled. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 20, 53-57.

Mithaug, D., & Horiuchi, C. (1983). Colorado statewide follow-up survey of special education students and appendices. Denver, CO: Colorado State Department of Education: Colorado Springs: University of Colorado, School of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 250902).

Mithaug, D., Horiuchi, C., & Fanning, P. (1985). A report on the Colorado statewide follow-up survey of special education students. Exceptional Children, 51(5), 397-404.

Muehl, S., & Forell, E. (1973-1974). A follow-up study of disabled readers - Variables related to high school reading performance. Reading Research Quarterly, 9, 110-123.

Muench, G.A. (1944). A follow-up of mental defectives after eighteen years. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 39, 407-418.

Mullen, F. (1952). Mentally retarded youth find jobs. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 31, 20-25.

National Information Center for Handicapped Children and Youth (1985). What happens to youth with learning disabilities after school? News Digest, June, 4-5.

O'Callaghan, R., & John T. (1983). Adult status of mildly retarded past-pupils from special education. Part one: Employment. International Journal of Rehabilitation Research, 6, 19-28.

Ohwaki, S. (1974). Behavioral characteristics of rehabilitated retarded persons. Journal of Mental Deficiency, 79, 385-390.

Okolo, M., & Sitlington, P. (1986). The role of special education in LD adolescents' transition from school to work. Learning Disability Quarterly, 9, 141-155.

Olin, I. (1930). The social adjustment of children of low intelligence. Smith College Studies in Social Work, 1(2), 107-173.

Olshansky, S., & Beach, C. (1975). A five-year follow-up of physically disabled clients. Rehabilitation Literature, 36(8), 251-258.

Owens, J., & Stocking, C. (1985). High school and beyond: A longitudinal study for the 1980's. Characteristics of high school students who identify themselves as handicapped. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics.

Peterson, L. (1959). The Mentally Retarded As Citizens. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, Iowa City.

Peterson, L., & Smith, L. (1960). The post-school adjustment of educable mentally retarded adults with that of adults of normal intelligence. Exceptional Children, 26, 404-408.

Phelps. H. (1956). Post-school adjustment of mentally retarded children in selected Ohio cities. Exceptional Children, 23, 58-63.

Portland Public Schools, (1971). Educable mentally retarded follow-up study: Class of 1965. Unpublished manuscript, Portland Public Schools, Portland, OR.

Powers, G., & Lewis, J. (1976). 1970-1975 follow-up of hearing impaired graduates of Pennsylvania. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania State Department of Education.

Preston, R., & Yarington, D. (1967). Status of fifty retarded readers eight years after reading clinic diagnosis. Journal of Reading, 11, 122-129.

Quincy, M. (1982). The "after 22" survey. Massachusetts Department of Education; Division of Special Education. (Survey Report #1: Statewide Survey).

Rader, B., Shapiro, H., & Rodin, A. (1978). On placement of multiply handicapped clients into the open job market. Rehabilitation Literature, 39(10), 299-302.

Rawson, M.B. (1968). Developmental language disability: Adult accomplishments of dyslexic boys. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins Press.

Reich, C. (1973). Vocational specialization and occupational placement: A follow-up study. Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 21, 281-287.

Richardson, S. (1978). Careers of mentally retarded young persons: Services, jobs, and interpersonal relations. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 82, 349-358.

Richardson, N., & Krieger, N. (1976). An evaluation of vocational placement success at a comprehensive rehabilitation center. Rehabilitation Literature, 37(8), 237-241.

Riddle, K., & Rapoport, J. (1976).. A 2-year follow-up of 72 hyperactive boys. The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 162, 126-134.

Robinson, H., & Smith, H. (1962). Reading clinic clients: Ten years after. Elementary School Journal, 63, 22-27.

Ross, R. Begab, M., Dondis, E., Giampiccolo, J., & Meyers, E. (1985). Lives of the Mentally Retarded: A Forty Year Follow-Up. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Rourke, B., & Orr, R. (1977). Prediction of the reading and spelling performances of normal and retarded readers: A four-year follow-up. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 5, 9-20.

Rusch, F., & Phelps, L. (1987). Secondary special education and transition from school to work: A national priority. Exceptional Children, 53, 487-492.

Rusiniak, N. (1974) Recreation for the retarded - One institution's approach.Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, April, 85-87.

Saenger, G. (1957). The adjustment of severely retarded adults in the community. Albany, NY: Interdepartmental Health Resource Board.

Sali, J., & Amir, M. (1971). Personal factors influencing the retarded person's success at work: A report from Israel. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 76(1), 42-47.

Schafer, C., (1976). Follow-up survey by mail. Social Work, 21, 327-328.

Schalock, R., Harper, R., and Carver, G. (1981). Independent living placement: Five years later. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 86(2), 170-177.

Schalock, R., Harper, R., & Genung, T. (1981). American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 77, 283-290.

Schalock, R., Karan, O., & Harper, R. (1980). An evaluation-remediation model for serving people with significant handicaps. Mental Retardation, 18, 231-233.

Schalock, R., Wolzen, B., Ross, I., Elliott, B., Werbel, G., & Peterson, K. (1986). Post-secondary community placement of handicapped individuals: A five-year follow-up analysis. Learning Disability Quarterly.

Shanyfelt, P. (1974). Occupational preparation of secondary educable students. Pointer, 19, 106-110.

Sher, J. (1978). A proposal to end federal neglect of rural schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 60, 280-282.

Shimberg, M., & Reichenberg, W. (1933). The success and failure of sub-normal problem children in the community. Mental Hygiene, 17, 451-465.

Shore, M., & Joseph, L. (1979). Fifteen years after treatment: A follow-up study of comprehensive vocationally-oriented psychotherapy. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 49, 240-245.

Sigelman, C., Schoenrock, C., Spankel, C., Hromas, S., Winer, J., Budd, E., & Martin, P. (1980). Surveying mentally retarded persons: Responsiveness and response validity in three samples. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 84, 479-486.

Silver, A., & Hagin, R. (1963). Specific reading disability: A twelve-year follow-up study. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 33, 338-339.

Silver, A., & Hagin, R. (1964). Specific reading disability: Follow-up studies. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 34, 95-102.

Silver, A., & Hagin, R. (1966). Maturation of perceptual functions in children with specific reading disability. The Reading Teacher, 10, 253-259.

Skaabrevik, K. (1971). A follow-up study of educable mentally retarded in Norway. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 75, 560-565.

Smith, H. (1975). Strategies of Social Research, (2nd Edition), Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Stanfield, J. (1973). Graduation: What happens to the retarded child when he grows up? Exceptional Children, 39, 548-553.

Steckel, M. (1934). A "follow-up" of mentally defective girls. Journal of Social Psychology, 5, 112-115.

Storrs, H. (1929). A report on an investigation made of cases discharged from Letchworth Village (considering especially their adjustment in the community). Proceedings & Addresses of the American Association for the Study of the Feebleminded, 34, 220-232.

Strickland, C., & Arrell, V. (1976). Employment of the mentally retarded. Exceptional Children, 34, 21-24.

Suther, P., Mayeda, T., Yee, S., & Yanagi, G. (1981). Community placement success based on client behavior preferences of care providers. Mental Retardation, 19(3), 117-120.

Szymanski, E., & Danek, M. (1985). School to work transition for students with disabilities: Historical, current and conceptual issues. Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin. December, 81-88.

"The Association" (1973). Hearing impaired graduates of regular schools. Volta Review, 15, 233-253,.

Thomas, H. (1928). The employment history of auxiliary pupils between sixteen and twenty-one years of age in Springfield, Massachusetts. Proceedings & Addresses of the American Association for the Study of the Feebleminded, 33, 132-148.

Titus, R. & Travis, J. (1973). Follow-up of EMR program graduates. Mental Retardation, 11, 24-26.

Tobias, J. (1970). Vocational adjustment of young retarded adults. Mental Retardation, 8, 13-16.

Town, C. (1931). An investigation of the adjustment of the feebleminded in the community. The Psychological Clinic, 20, 42-54.

Trites, R., & Fiedorowicz, C. (1976). Follow-up study of children with specific or primary reading disability. In R. Knights & D. Bakker (Eds.). The neuropsychology of learning disorders: Theoretical approaches. Baltimore, MD: University Press.

VanDeventer, P., Yelinek, N., Brown, L., Schroeder, J., Loomis, R., & Gruenewald, L. (1981). A follow-up examination of severely handicapped graduates of the Madison Metropolitan School District from 1971-1978. In L. Brown, D. Baumgart, I. Pumpiaan, J. Nisbet, A. Ford, A. Donnellan, M. Sweet, R. Loomis, & J. Schroeder (Eds.), Educational programs for severely handicapped students, Vol. XI, (pp. 1-177). Madison, WI: Madison Metropolitan School District.

Vermont Department of Education. (1982). Follow-up study of graduates/leavers of diversified occupations program in Vermont.

Vogel, H., (1975). A follow-up study of former student patients at the Crippled Children's Hospital and School, Sioux Falls, South Dakota. Rehabilitation Literature, 36(9), 270-273.

Walsh, W. (1968). Validity of self report - another look. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 15, 180-186.

Wang, M., Reynolds, M., & Walberg, H. (1986). Rethinking special education. Educational Leadership, September, 26-31.

Wardell, W. (1946). The adjustment of moron males in a group placement. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 50, 425-433.

Wehman, P. (1983) Toward the employability of severely handicapped children and youth. Teaching Exceptional Children, 15, 220-225.

Wehman, P., et al. (available October, 1987). Transition from school to work Chapter Two: What happens to youth with disabilities after they grow up? Palm Brooks Publishing Company, in press, 42-69.

Wehman, P., Hill, M., Hill, J., Brooke, V., Pendleton, P., & Britt, C. (1985). Competitive employment for persons with mental retardation: A follow-up six years later. Mental Retardation, 23(6), 274-281.

Wehman, P. & Hill, J. (1980). Preparing severely and profoundly handicapped youth to enter less restrictive environments. In P. Wehman and J. Hill (Eds.) Instructional Programming for Severely Handicapped Youth: A Community Integration Approach. (pp. 1-23) Richmond, VA: School of Education, Virginia Commonwealth University.

Wehman, P., Kregel, S., & Seyfarth, J. (1985). Transition from school to work for individuals with severe handicaps: A follow-up study. The Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps. 10(3), 132-136.

Wehman, P., Kregel, J., & Seyfarth, J. (1985). Employment outlook for young adults with mental retardation. Rehabilitation on Counseling Bulletin, December, 90-99.

Wehman, P., Kregel, J., & Barccus, M. (1985). From school to work - a vocational transition model for handicapped students. Exceptional Children, 52(1), 25-37.

Wehman, P., Hill, J., Wood, W., & Parent, W. (1987). A report on competitive employment histories of persons labled severely mentally retarded. The Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 12(1), 11-17.

Wehman, P., Moon, M., & McCarthy, P. (1986). Transition from school to adulthood for youth with severe handicaps. Focus on Exceptional Children, 18(5).

Weiner, P. (1972). The perceptual level functioning of dysphasic children: A follow-up study. Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 15, 423-438.

Werner, E., & Smith, R. (1979). An epidemiologic perspective on some antecedents and consequences of childhood mental health problems and learning disabilities: A report from the Kauai longitudinal study. Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry, 18, 292-306.

Wheeler, J., Brankin, G., Nihill, R., Smith, B., McDannel, K., Costello, D., Peters, W., & Greagon, S. (1983). A Follow-Up Examination of Severely Handicapped Graduates of the DeKalb County Special Education Association from 1978-1982. Unpublished manuscript, Northern Illinois University and DeKalb County Special Education Association.

Whitcomb, M. (1945). A comparison of social and intellectual levels of 100 high-grade adult mental defectives. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 50, 257-262.

White, J. Alley, G., Deshler, D., Schumaker, J., Warner, M., & Clark, F. (1982). Are there learning disabilities after high school? Exceptional Children, 49, 273-274.

Will, M. (1983). OSERS programming for the transition of youth with disabilities: Bridges from school to working life. Washington, D.C.: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 256132).

Wilton, K., & Cosson, L. (1977). Employment and adjustment of special education graduates in a New Zealand city. Australian Journal of Mental Retardation, 4(5), 3-7.

Wolfson, I. (1956). Follow-up studies of 92 male and 131 female patients who were discharged from the Newark State School in 1946. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 61, 224-238.

Yule, W. (1973). Differential prognosis of reading backwardness and specific reading retardation. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 43, 244-248.

Zider, S. & Gold, M. (1981). Behind the wheel training for individuals labeled moderately retarded. Exceptional Children, May, 632-639.

Zigmond, N., Thornton, H., & Kohnke, R. (1986). Predictors of high school dropout in urban LD and NLD youth. Pittsburg, PA: University of Pittsburg, School of Education.

Zigmond, N., & Thornton, H. (1985). Follow-up of postsecondary age learning disabled graduates and dropouts. Learning Disabilities Research, 1(1), 50-55.

APPENDIX 1

FIRST PANEL OF EXPERTS
CAL STATE ADIVISORY PANEL

Rhonda Israel*	Teacher-Regular Education
Gerald Peterson*	Teacher-Vocational Education
Robert Kingrey*	Teacher-Developmentally Disabled
Laurie Smith*	Parent/Occupational Therapy
Kelly Weakly*	Teacher-Preschool
Sue Munson*	Teacher-Physically Handicapped
Joan Hayes*	Teacher-Physically Handicapped
Shirley Desist*	Teacher-Developmentally Disabled
Craig Williams*	Teacher-Severely Emotionally Disturbed
Delores Campa*	Teacher-Developmentally Disabled
Nancy Percy*	Teacher-Preschool
Rolla Parks*	Substitute Teacher-Postal Clerk
Anita Addis*	Teacher-Severely Handicapped
Chris LeRoy*	Teacher-Developmentally Disabled
Connie Holcomb*	Administrator-Special Education Programs
Melanie Lavering*	Teacher-Severely Handicapped
Mary Sutton	Complete Technology Professional
Andy Schultz	Professor-Vocational Education
Shirley Bailey	Teacher-Developmentally Disabled

*Participated as lst field test interviewers

SECOND PANEL OF EXPERTS
RIVERSIDE CROSS AGENCY ADVISORY PANEL

Bobbie Washington	Parent and Member of Community Advisory Committee
Michael Vincent	Employer and Director of Association for Retarded Citizens
Rich Bagwell	Program Supervisor -- Department of Rehabilitation
Rich Williams	Habilitation Counselor Department of Rehabilitation
Barbara Tobin	Case Worker-Inland Regional Center
Robert Costello	Directior-Mental Health Services of San Bernardino
David Hutchins	Principal-Norte Vista Continuation High School
Tom Wojciehowski	Principal-Lucy Siegrist Special School
Louise Burton	Professor-Coordinator of Special Education, California State University San Bernardino
Robin Faigin	Career/Vocational Education Resource Teacher - Special Education
Rebecca Towner	Career/Vocational Education Resource Teacher - Special Education

APPENDIX 3

A SAMPLING OF
FOLLOW-UP SURVEY INFORMATION
CALIFORNIA SCHOOL DISTRICTS

ALAMEDA CITY USD
Alameda, CA

Survey Population: Regular education seniors
Data Collection Process: Mailout
Content: Employment and satisfaction (high school classes)
* Baseline completed by senior includes demographic as well as program evaluation and future plans. Results are reported and compared between three secondary schools: Alameda, Encinal and Island with return rates of 78-89%.

ALAMEDA COUNTY
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
Hayward, CA

Survey Population: Special education seniors with severe handicaps
Data Collection Process: Mailout
Content: Employment, transportation, residential, social/recreation, and additional specialized services
* Survey is in the form of an interagency transition planning team to project agency needs of students with severe handicaps who are near school completion.

GROSSMONT UNION
HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
La Mesa, CA

Survey Population: Regular education graduates and dropouts
Data Collection Process: Two mailouts with telephone contact for non-respondents
Content: Future plans, employment, further training, and satisfaction
* Sample included 455 graduates and 335 school leavers from eleven districts with a response rate of 90%. Results are analyzed and published in a complete report available to school personnel, parents and others. Report has strong emphasis on former students' perception of the usefulness of various aspects of the school program.

KERN UNION
HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
Bakersfield, CA

Survey Population: Regular education seniors
Data Collection Process: In-school survey
Content: Demographic and current program
* Baseline information only

LONG BEACH USD
Long Beach, CA

Survey Population: Regular education graduates
Data Collection Process: Mailout postcard
Content: Employment and further training
* Sample included 805 of a total population of 3,366. Reported return rate of 66%.

LOS ANGELES USD
Los Angeles, CA

Survey Population: Regular, continuation, opportunity and special education graduates
Data Collection Process: Three mailouts
Content: Education, employment, and satisfaction
* All even year graduating classes are surveyed during the first semester of their last year to elicit opinions about their programs and to gain information on post-school plans. At end of first year out of school a sample of odd year graduates are asked to complete a 59 item survey form. LAUSD also collects data on students entering California colleges and universities. A Likert type scale is used to solicit opinions relative to course, activities and instruction.

MERCED COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS
Merced, CA

Survey Population: Special education graduates and dropouts
Data Collection Process: Telephone contact
Content: Employment, further training, agency assistance and residential status
* Study administered by Merced SELPA to survey 28 special education teachers in eight high schools and students who had exited special education programs July-September 1985. Volunteers from the CAC conducted the telephone survey. A script was developed for use by interviewers and data were coded and analyzed using computer software.

OAKLAND USD
Oakland, CA

Survey Population: Regular education seniors
Data Collection Process: Senior exit interview
Content: Future plans, further training, employment plans, and satisfaction
* A senior exit survey is completed by all students prior to leaving school to achieve information on projected future plans.

SAN BERNARDINO USD
San Bernardino, CA

Survey Population: Continuation and regular education seniors
Data Collection Process: Telephone contact (senior summary)
Content: Military, further training, and employment
* Students from three comprehensive high schools (1,067) and two continuation schools (118) were surveyed to determine their current status. Data were analyzed by total and single school breakdown.

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS
San Diego, CA

Survey Population: Regular, magnet, and special education graduates
Data Collection Process: Two mailouts with telephone contact for non-respondents
Content: Employment, further training, and satisfaction
* One sixth of the graduating class of 6,250 were surveyed. University students were employed to conduct the third annual survey. The district research department is also involved in a five year longitudinal study and has participated in the High School and Beyond study. A total of twenty one regular and six atypical schools were involved. Return rate among the schools were involved. Return rate among the schools ranged from 68% to 92% for the regular schools and 12% to 73% for the atypical schools, with an average of 79% for mail and telephone.

SANTA BARBARA
HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
Santa Barbara, CA

Survey Population: Special education seniors
Data Collection Process: Written forms
Content: Academic, vocational profiles, and future goals
* Follow-up procedures consist of in school data collection to assist in planning for successful post-school transition.

SANTA CRUZ COUNTY
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
Capitola, CA

Survey Population: Special education graduates and parents, seniors and parents
Data Collection Process: Mailout
Content: Residential status, employment, agency support, and further training
* Separate written survey instruments are used with higher functioning learning handicapped graduates, parents of graduates and parents of undergraduates to secure information helpful for successful transition.

CAPISTRANO-LAGUNA ROP
Laguna, CA

Data Collection Process: Telephone contact (three attempts)
Content: Employment, further training, and rate/ROP training
* Form includes space for extra comments

COASTLINE ROP
Costa Mesa ROP

Data Collection Process: Two mailouts with telephone contact for non-respondents
Content: Program evaluation, employment, further training, and satisfaction
* Coded questionnaires are sent to San Mateo for data printouts which are incorporated into an annual report. Currently using TRACK II but will be using State Department of Education accountability system, VE-45, for 1986-87.

FRESNO COUNTY ROP
Fresno, CA

Data Collection Process: Telephone contact
Content: Employment, program evaluation, and additional question section specific to individual districts
* Using VEA-45A plus adding four individual questions for each geographical area (Fresno USD, Clovis USD, ROC, Washington USD, Sierra USD, Coalinga USD and Madera USD). Differentiates between school leavers and completers in sample. Surveyed 2,678 of total 4,300 attenders with response rate of 73%. Pre-survey baseline data taken from ROP enrollment form. Population surveyed includes handicapped, LEP, and disadvantaged. Telephone guidelines and script included. Also asks relationship of current job to ROP program and person or agency that helped to get job.

KERN COUNTY ROP
Mojave, CA

Data Collection Process: In-school survey
Content: Employment, education/training, and program evaluation

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
OFFICE OF EDUCATION ROP
Downey, CA

Data Collection Process: Mailout
Content: Employment, further training, and
* Besides the mailout questionnaire, a sampling of ROP graduates also receive an extensive telephone survey.

MENDICINO COUNTY
SCHOOLS ROP
Ukiah, CA

Data Collection Process: Postcard mailout, telephone contact for non-respondents
Content: Employment, further training, reasons for taking, and ROP classes
* Instructors completed baseline follow-up data at bottom of form upon completion of class. Registration and follow-up data is put on computer for final reporting.

SAN DIEGO COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION ROP	**Data Collection Process:** Mailout **Content:** Program evaluation, further training, and employment. * Used a brief form (17 questions) in 1986, plans to use a longer form (39 questions) in 1987. Also asks specific questions about course work and instructors, how far traveled to take ROP class and type of transportation used.
SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY ROP **San Francisco, CA**	**Data Collection Process:** Mailout **Content:** Employment, program evaluation, further training
SANTA CRUZ COUNTY ROP **Santa Cruz, CA**	**Data Collection Process:** Telephone contact with mailouts for those who could not be reached. **Content:** Employment, military service, and further training * Part-time work experience students conduct telephone survey, input data in computer (Apple IIe and PFS software) and do mailouts as needed. Contacts with 3,500 former students yielded a return rate of 70%. Plans to work directly from student attendance data base (Infostar) in 1987-88 to save time on initial data entry. Also asks if ROP skills are used on their present job. Found mailouts very expensive and had a poor return rate.
SHASTA-TRINITY COUNTY ROP **Redding, CA**	**Data Collection Process:** Telephone contact in the local area; mailout for long distance and non-respondents **Content:** Employment, further training, and military service * Follow for three years after enrollment in ROP program. Are updating to meet State Department of Education guidelines for 1987-88. Sets up file on students when they are juniors. Calls are made during Christmas/New Years week.
SISKIYOU COUNTY ROP **Yreka, CA**	**Data Collection Process:** Mailout for parents with a teacher-questionnaire **Content:** Employment, further training, and military service * Small town rural area where teachers know of whereabouts of most graduates/leavers. Found postcard mailouts to parents had poor response rate. Requested that rural nature of locals be considered in developing a follow-up system.

TRI-COUNTY ROP
Yuba City, CA

Data Collection Process: Two mailouts with telephone contact for non-respondents
Content: Program evaluation and employment
* Two phases were used in the follow-up system employed. First student completes baseline data sheet when entering ROP course. Following graduation ROP central office staff call all former students who spent 20 or more hours in ROP programming. 2,919 students enrolled, served, and followed-up on for 100% response rate.

VENTURA COUNTY ROP
Camarillo, CA

Data Collection Process: Telephone contact
Content: Employment, further training, job history, and military service
* Baseline demographics are gathered by the teachers while the student is still in school. Reported that response rate on letters has been poor. Call all students to achieve a 91-95% response rate over the past three years.

CALIFORNIA
UC Santa Barbara
Santa Barbara, CA

Survey Population: Special Education - Workability Project and Non-Workability
Data Collection Process: Student record information, teacher interviews and telephone contacts
Content: School records and employment information
* This study used matched groups of students who were and were not in Workability programs to assess the effects of high school work experience. Field workers and workability coordinators collected the data.

COLORADO
University of Colorado and Colorado State Department of Education
Colorado Springs, CO

Survey Population: Special education graduates
Data Collection Process: Personal interview
Content: Employment, military service, residential, satisfaction and quality of life.
* Interviews were conducted with 234 graduates from twenty-six administrative units. The sample included students with mental retardation, perceptual-communication, behavioral and physical problems. Background information was gathered from school records and trained university students conducted the interviews. The instrument is twelve pages long.

DECISION RESEARCH, INC.
Headquarters:
Santa Barbara, CA

Survey Population: All graduates/school leavers (usually regular education)
Data Collection Process: Two mailouts with telephone contact for non-respondents
Content: Employment, further training, satisfaction and extracurricular activities
* This private research agency uses a survey form which is adapted for individual schools. School personnel collect baseline data and the agency completes the follow-up study. This agency averages an eighty-five percent success rate.

FLORIDA
Florida State Department of Education

Survey Population: Regular education graduates
Data Collection Process: Mailout
Content: Employment information
* Two state forms, two pages each, are used to elicit information from former vocational students and their current employers. Former students are asked to indicate how they got their job, their salary, and suggestions for improving their vocational programs. Employers were asked to rate the former students work and work-related skills.

"NIGAN higan Department of ducation	Survey Population: Regular Education graduates Data Collection Process: Mailout Content: Employment, military service, and further training * The survey form is divided into six parts: high school data, employment, post-high school education, military, unemployment, and comments.
OHIO Akron-Summit County Public Schools Akron, OH	Survey Population: Regular education graduates Data Collection Process: Mailout Content: Further training, military survey and transportation. * This one-page mailout form is used by Job Placement Department to determine current work status. Another more comprehensive five-page form is used by the public school to gather information on employment as well as school evaluation and further education. Data are key punched and stored for further comparisons.
PENNSYLVANIA Bloomsburg State College and the State Department of Education	Survey Population: Deaf (regular education) graduates Data Collection Process: Letter of introduction, personal interview Content: Employment, further training and communication methods used * Respondents include one hundred sixty seven students who had completed school over a five-year period. These students were selected from a pool of approximately six hundred referrals for the study. In addition to the students, employers and parents were also interviewed.
PACIFIC MANAGEMENT AND RESEARCH ASSOCIATES Sacramento, CA	Survey Population: Students from post-high school vocational programs Data Collection Process: Mailout with telephone contact for non-respondents Content: Current employment, goals, education and program evaluation * This instrument provides data on goals, education and employment of former vocational students and a match between training and job requirements. Information on employment status of former students is coded and entered into an IBM compatible form for use across a variety of agencies.
VERMONT University of Vermont	Survey Population: Graduates with mental retardation, learning disabilities Data Collection Process: Telephone interviews Content: Employment and agency support * Project staff interviewed four hundred sixty two former students from nine school districts who had exited over a four year period. The eleven page forty-seven item interview form was used to interview parents, spouses, grandparents, and the former students to gather information on employment variables.

VIRGINIA **Virginia Commonwealth University and RRTC**	**Survey Population:** Former students with mild, moderate and severe handicaps **Data Collection Process:** Personal interview **Content:** Employment, satisfaction, transportation, independent living and quality of life * The six page, fifty-seven item instrument was used to study the post-school working and living status of three hundred former students with mild to severe mental retardation in a region of Virginia. Questions cover a wide range of topics. The authors reported a sixty-eight percent response rate.
WASHINGTON **University of Washington Seattle, WA**	**Survey Population:** Former students with mild, moderate, and severe handicaps, multiple and physical handicaps, deaf/blindness, learning disabilities and behavior disorders **Data Collection Process:** Telephone interviews **Content:** Employment satisfaction and residential status * Interviews were conducted with 1,292 former students and 936 parents of students who graduated or left school, from fifteen districts, across an eight year period. An additional one hundred seven non-handicapped students were included for a longitudinal study which will continue for three years.
WISCONSIN **University of Wisconsin and Madison Metropolitan Schools**	**Survey Population:** Former students with severe handicaps **Data Collection Process:** Interviews with teachers and vocational agencies with telephone contacts for clarification **Content:** Employment, transportation, supervision, and SSI Information * This study included thirty two students with severe intellectual disabilities across a three year period. The sample included former students who lived in residences. The questionnaire emphasized gathering data on employment and work-related skills.

OBJECTIVES FOR INITIAL FOLLOW-UP SURVEY FORM,
SPECIAL EDUCATION GRADUATE SURVEY

1. **To record information about the Interview Process from all forms completed.**

   Included in this is the interviewer name along with all those present during each interview and their relationship to the graduate/leaver. Added to this information is the location of the interview and the time and date.

2. **To collect demographic information on all interview participants.**

   Besides the name of the respondent in the interview and the relationship of the respondent to the former students, a category is necessary for the name of the former student in cases where the respondent is a significant other and the student does not participate. Also included is gender, date of birth, marital status, and cultural background. The type of former school program by category is noted, as well as the exit date from the program, age upon leaving, and geographic location of home and school. Medical status is addressed, specifically heart conditions, physical impairments or seizure disorders.

3. **To inquire about and collect vocational information on all school graduate/leavers surveyed.**

   Vocational information identified as critical in this section includes current employment situation whether working or not employed If employed, information on current position, length of time at position, gross monthly wages, and form of transportation used to get to and from the employment site are tallied. Information about benefits above and beyond wages are gathered as well as what agency if any helped the graduate acquire the position. Lastly, satisfaction with present career placement is measured, using a scale of extremely happy with job, satisfied, bored or planning to quit job. If not employed, job history is recorded as well as possible reasons for not being employed. The total amount of money earned since leaving school is also recorded, as is information on employment preparation services provided by agencies, both before and after leaving school.

4. **To record information on living situation and independence achieved by all survey participants.**

   Included in this data are place of residence, activities where participation is experienced in the community, domestic skills

taught while in school age, services, and independent domest tasks completed regularly. In the domain of personal self ca , which skills were taught in school and how many skills are used routinely with improvement overall measured subjectively.

5. **To collect data on personal life style and quality of life of all interview participants.**

Initial information is gathered on requirements in school regarding minimum competency tests taken before exit from school services followed by times and places where the graduate spends time weekly in the community and which activities are enjoyed at home. Membership in clubs, attendance at special events, and other uses of leisure time are explored. Other activities include availability of sex education, voter registration and problems encountered as well as satisfaction with current personal situation. Training in the use of community services and continuing use of those skills is recorded.

FOLLOW-UP SURVEY SUMMARY ANALYSIS HIGHLIGHTS*
INITIAL FIELD TEST

1. How did you locate interviewees (source)?

Classroom teacher/aide	50%
Former students	22%
Records	17%
Principals	5%

2. How did you handle confidentiality?

Assured interviewees	33%
Took confidentiality letters	22%
Used interviewee initials	27%

3. What survey barriers were encountered?

None	33%
Service providers	33%
Significant other	11%
Coordinating time	5%

4. What questions solicited biased information?

None	39%
Voting status	44%
Feelings toward school	11%
Independent living	5%

5. Time needed for interview

Completed interview in less than 30 minutes	78%
Range 15 minutes to 2 hours	

6. Interfering conditions

Needed a translator	11%
Form too long	17%

7. Which questions did interviewees refuse to answer?

Answered all	56%
Passed on "friends of opposite sex" question	5%
Passed on questions related to current financial situation	17%

8. Redundant questions noted by interviewers

None	22%
Voting status	22%
Feelings toward school	28%

9. Probing necessary to elicit responses

None	17%
Vocabulary simplified	11%
Restate	61%

10. Questions needing clarification

None	33%
Concerning interviewee feelings	33%
Technical terms	5%
Cultural difference (language)	5%

11. Other frequently occurring responses

Interviewees stated that they "missed school"	22%
Interviewers indicated that they felt student was uncomfortable talking about past school experiences	17%
Parents indicated that they were uncomfortable talking about their child's future	28%
Interviewees reported to be compliant and anxious to "please" the interviewer	28%

* NOTE: N = 18 interviewers
(not all interviewers responded to each summary question - so percentages may not add to 100% in each category)

FOLLOW-UP SURVEY

SUMMARY ANALYSIS HIGHLIGHTS

FIELD TEST II

TYPE OF INTERVIEW	COMPLETED	ATTEMPTED
Mail	3	20
Phone	17	67
Personal	40	44
Total	60	131

1. How was former student located? — N/A

2. How was confidentiality handled?
   - 92% -- not an issue
   - 8% -- explained to interviewer

3. What barriers were encountered?
   - 25% -- no barriers
   - 75% -- barriers were encountered

   Examples:

   A. Interviewee had poor communication skills
   B. Deaf interviewees need interpreters or TTY's to communicate
   C. Interviewees were interviewed at work during breaks
   D. Interviewee missed appointment for personal interview
   E. Care providers were interviewed - could not answer many questions accurately

4. Did any questions solicit biased information?
   - 90% -- no
   - 10% -- yes: 5% on Question #18*
     5% on Question #20*

5. Time needed to complete the interview:

   - 50% -- 10 minutes
   - 25% -- 10 to 20 minutes
   - 10% -- 20 minutes
   - 10% -- 30 to 60 minutes
   - 5% -- 8 minutes

6. Did interviewer know interviewee already? — N/A

7. Did interviewee pass on questions?
   - 86% -- no
   - 14% -- yes

8. Were some questions redundant?

86% -- no
14% -- yes: #9,#18,#20 & #21*

9. What types of probes were needed?

28% -- needed to use probes (on Questions #7,#17,#19, #20 and #21)*
72% -- did not need probes

10. Which questions needed clarification?

54% -- needed to clarify questions
46% -- did not need to clarify questions

Questions needing clarification: #3, #4, #7, #11, #12, #13, #17, #18, #20 & #21*

11. How long had graduates been in program? N/A

12. Other Comments:

A. Interviewer felt personal interviews were biased because interviewer can read body language, voice tone, and facial expressions.

B. Interviewee couldn't answer some questions -- asked his job coach to answer.

C. Personal interviews encouraged interviewee to talk more than needed.

D. Personal interviews take longer to complete.

E. Conversation with interviewee answered many questions.

* Please Note: The responses relate to our fourth draft which is numbered differently than our final Follow-Up Instrument

RESPONSE TO ETC TECHNICAL REVIEW TEAM REVISIONS

I. BQ Baseline Questions

A. General Reaction

Who will fill out BQ for non-readers, etc?

(BQ page 4) Good idea to have 2 contact references.

(BQ page 6, #9-16) This is an evaluative question for agencies.

(BQ page 8, #32) This is a good goal question but the order of questions needs addressing.

(BQ pages 9-11, #33) We like the rewording of statements, however want to stay with "happy" scale.

Comments: Who will fill out BQ for non-readers, or those experiencing cultural or language differences? The form itself seems quite lengthy and a question arose concerning the scales changing from 3-4-5.

B. Items not necessary

(BQ page 5, #5 and 8) Is this important to know while they are still in high school?

(BQ pages 6-7, #17-21) Why yes/no as opposed to a scale, where did these questions come from and for what purpose?

(BQ page 7, #22-31) How were these persons chosen? Why a 3 point scale instead of 5?

(BQ page 12, #44-51) Where did these questions originate from? How will they be helpful in program evaluation?

C. Questions under consideration of incorporation

(SSRIB page 5, #18) Split out

(SSRIB page 8, #25) Good format for identifying high-risk population.

D. Other questions or exculsions

(SSRIB page 5, #18) What is "Specialized Disability Resource Program?" If its specifically an RSP then it should be labeled or go back to using "special education program."

(SSRIB page 6, #20) Answering #19 gives you answer for #20

(SSRIB) page 6, #21) Split out like original #10, baseline form

(SSRIB page 7, #22-24) Use original #20-22, baseline form

(SSRIB page 8, #26) Needs group input as all districts are different

II. FUQ Follow Up Questionnaire

A. Questions under consideration of incorporation

Many are duplicates of original questions from the Riverside Project.

(FUQ 1.56) Statements are worded succinctly.

(FUQ 1.66) Would like to continue with happy scale.

Note errors next to FUQ 1.1 and 1.33, script uses "we" instead of "I"

B. Other qeustions or exclusions

(FUQ 1.4) What is is the objective for answering this questios?

(FUQ 1.9-1.16) What is the rationale behind these questions? Is all this information necessary? Where was the list generated?

(FUQ 1.18) Is there a reason for retrieving this information?

(FUQ 1.26-1.32) May be suitable, but where did the questions originate?

(FUQ 1.26-1.32) Add college and continuing education as options.

(Fuq 1.34) Is this information necessary?

(FUQ 1.36-1.46) More suitable seems to be original #20a and #20b. Why were regular HS courses grouped together as general ed. The original #20b incorporates community based curriculum for Special Education. Why eliminate evaluation component of question. "How much did you use what you learned?" #1.36-#1.46 need to be tiered for diploma bound versus special education differential standards graduates. (See original baseline question #24)

(FUQ 1.47-1.55) Why separate civilian/military? This language would not be appropriate for all populations. (original #16 modified) Why do we want to know yes/no on all people listed, objective for these questions and rationale?

(FUQ 1.67-1.74) Where do these inquiries originate and what information will be examined?

Follow up Instrument Review Form

Source of instrument:

Name of instrument:
Date reviewed: **Reviewer:**
Population used with: (describe if necessary)
__ **LH/SDC**
__ **RSP**
__ **High Risk**
__ **ROP**
__ **SH**
__ **Other work program** (JTPA, GAIN)
__ **Other** (explain)

Purpose of interview form: (explain if necessary)
__ **Career/job info**
__ **Background about schooling/coursework**
__ **Demographics**
__ **Quality of life**
__ **Independent living**
__ **Other**

Survey coverage: __ **statewide** __ **local** __ **county** __ **regional**
__**other:**
Does it include directions or a script? __ **yes** __ **no**
Who is the interviewee? __ **parent** __ **significant others** __ **student**
Any information on data analysis or results?

Summary:

Other comments:

Follow-up Literature Review Form

Bibliography:

(Author, title of article, where published, Vol. # and issue, when published, page # ___ to ___)

Transition:

Population:

Follow-up:

Competitive Employment:

Career Education:

New Sources: (in bibliography)

Comments:

Cross References:

- ☐ parents
- ☐ curriculum
- ☐ employers
- ☐ survey
- ☐ statistics
- ☐ research
- ☐ promotion
- ☐ resignations
- ☐ wages
- ☐ recreation
- ☐ pre-vocational
- ☐ associated skills
- ☐ career planning
- ☐ family
- ☐ adaptations
- ☐ OJT
- ☐ graduation requirements
- ☐ differential standards
- ☐ academic skills
- ☐ pre-requisites
- ☐ barriers
- ☐ job placements
- ☐ job matching
- ☐ retention
- ☐ hiring
- ☐ SSI
- ☐ other _____

Follow-up Survey Summary

Interviewer: **Date:**
Type of Interview: **Interviewee Code:**

Directions: Fill out one summary on each interview you conduct with a special education graduate/leaver (or parent/significant other). Use the section at the end of the survey or back of this form for further comments about specific questions or incidental information.

1. How did you locate the special education graduate/leaver for interview?

2. How did you handle the issue or questions about confidentiality?

3. What barriers were encountered in this process of identifing a graduate/leaver, arranging and conducting an interview, and recording information.

4. Did specific questions solicit biased information? Which ones and why?

5. How much time was needed to complete the interview itself? Any interfering conditions?

6. Did you know the interviewee prior to this interview? If yes, in what capacity?

7. Was it clear to interviewee that they could "pass" on questions? ___ Did they? ___ Which ones?

8. Were some qns redundant or unnecessary? ___ Which ones?

9. What types of/ing questions were needed to get accurate information?

10. Which ques needed more clarification?

11. How long graduates/leavers in school-age special education services?

    -any special of services?

12. Other comments about this particular interview?

Evaluation Form (Critique)

Name: (optional)
Position/Title:
Years at present position: **Years in education:**

Directions: Baseline information sheet (pages 1 - 4) is attached. This information is being considered as data that needs to be collected during the last year of school by the homeroom teacher/case manager. Please answer the following questions, given the information above.

1. Do you feel this method of collecting information about our graduates/leavers is feasible? ___ yes ___ no If no, what suggestions can you make?

2. Since this information will be provided to help locate a student 1 - 3 years after leaving school, is there other information we should add? ___ yes ___ no If yes, could you give us some examples?

Follow up Questionnaire (pages 5 - 8) is also attached. This information is to be collected by an interviewer 1, 2 or 3 years after leaving school. Our initial findings are that these interviews should be handled over the telephone whenever possible rather than depending on mailouts or personal interviews. Our field test experience indicates telephone interviews are less costly, less intrusive and illicit more exact information. Please give us your opinion on the following:

3. Do you feel that the method of using the telephone to get this follow up information is an appropriate one? ___ yes ___ no Why?

4. Do you feel the content information on the follow up questionnaire will be useful to the district? ___ yes ___ no If yes, in what way?

If no, what would help?

5. Are there any other changes or comments you would like to make?

Thank you so much for taking time out for this survey!

Special Education Graduate Survey

Location _____ Interviewer _____
Date: _____ Present at interview: _____ _____
_____ _____

I. Demographics

A. Name of respondent _____
B. Relationship of respondent to former student
1.) self 2.) mother 3.) father 4.) legal guardian 5.) Other _____
C. Name of former student _____
D. Former student's sex ___ M ___ F Date of birth _____
E. Cultural background ___ caucasian ___ black ___ oriental ___ hispanic ___ other
F. Former student's marital status ___ single ___ married ___ separated/divorced
G. Former student's home location ___ rural ___ urban ___ suburban
H. School location ___ rural ___ urban ___ suburban
I. Month/year left school _____
J. Age upon leaving school _____
K. Type of school program or arrangement former student was in upon leaving school
___ resource room ___ special school site ___ special class in a regular school
___ regular classroom ___ other (_____)
L. Does former student have any medical problems that affect his/her daily life (heart condition, seizures, etc.)? ___ Yes ___ No
If yes, explain: _____
_____

II. Vocational

A. Current employment situation of former student:
___ full time (32 hours per week or more)
___ part time (1 - 31 hours per week)
___ volunteer work (with out pay) ___ hours per week
___ not employed
(If not currently employed, skip questions B - H ahead)
Questions B - H apply only to the currently employed

B. Currently employed as?
___ sheltered workshop employee
___ food service worker
___ janitorial/ cleaning worker
___ groundskeeping worker
___ farm/agricultural worker
___ office/clerical worker
___ part of a crew of handicapped individuals
___ other _____

C. Most frequent method of travel to and from work:
___ on foot
___ by car (parent drives)
___ by car (friend drives)
___ by public bus or dial-a-ride
___ by facility bus
___ carpool
___ bicycle
___ other

D. Length of time at present job:
___ 0-6 months ___ 7 months to 1 year ___ more than a year

E. Current gross monthly wages:
___ $0 - $50/month
___ $51 - $200/month
___ $201 - $500/month
___ $501 - $700/month
___ over $700/month

F. If currently employed in regular or sheltered employment, what benefits are received? Check all that apply.
___ meals
___ sick time
___ vacation time
___ no fringe benefits
___ insurance coverage
___ retirement package
___ profit sharing
___ other (explain) 140

G. Are you (son/daughter)
___ extremely happy with job ___ just satisfied with job
___ bored with job but not planning to quit ___ would like to or plans to quit job

H. What agency helped you find this job?
___ rehabilitation counselor ___ regional center worker
___ a friend ___ found job independently
___ a parent/relative ___ school counselor
___ teacher ___ ROP teacher
___ other (explain) _____

(Question I and J apply **only** to those who are **not** currently employed)

I. If not currently employed, has former student ever....(check all that apply)
___ worked in a real job since leaving school and for at least 3 months
___ worked in a sheltered workshop
___ attended an adult activity or work activity center
___ done volunteer work without pay (explain) _____

J. If not currently employed, is it because of any of the following reasons?
___ no skills for jobs in the area ___ do not want to give up SSI benefits
___ no one to help get a job ___ no transportation available
___ no one to provide job training ___ do not want to work
___ other (explain) _____

K. How many jobs held since leaving school?
___ 0 - 1 job ___ 2 - 3 jobs ___ 4 - 5 jobs ___ more than 5 jobs

L. Total amount earned since leaving school?
___ $0 - $999 ___ $4000 - $7999 ___ $12,000 - $14,999
___ $1000 - $3999 ___ $8000 - $11,999 ___ over $15,000

M. Have you (son/daughter) received employment services from local agencies? (check all that apply)
___ Rehabilitation ___ Habilitation
___ Employment Development Department (EDD) ___ Regional Center
___ Association for Retarded Citizens (ARC) ___ Mental Health
___ other (explain) _____

N. What employment services have been provided?
___ training and job placement
___ participation in day program to learn domestic, self-help and social/leisure skills
___ occasional visits to discuss job possibilities or other assistance
___ no community services have been provided
___ other (explain) _____

O. Have you (son/daughter) ever lost a job / resigned because of any of the following reason? (check all that apply)
___ problem with supervisor ___ work rate or ability lacking
___ lost transportation ___ job abolished
___ wanted SSI benefits instead ___ never had job
___ did not like job ___ did not want to work
___ other (explain) _____

P. What type of school vocational program did you (son/daughter) most frequently participate in? (check all that apply)
___ a structured skill training program in a regular vocational class
___ a special class with some practice vocational training (primarily on school grounds)
___ a special vocational training program with practice of work skills (primarily off school grounds)
___ a JTPA, Vortability, ROP, vocational education or other work experience program
___ no vocational education program

Q. Did you (son/daughter) receive **wages** for school programs in item "P" above?
___ yes ___ no

R. If yes, which programs provided wages? _____

_____

III. Independent Living

S. Where do you (son/daughter) live?
___ at home
___ group home
___ residential facility
___ supervised apartment
___ house or apartment independently
___ other (explain) _____

T. Do you (son/daughter) do any of the following?
___ walk in the community
___ ride a bicycle
___ have a driver's license
___ drive a car
___ use public transportation
___ mobility via wheelchair

U. Which of the above domestic skills were taught in school?
___ cooking
___ sewing
___ maintenance/repairs
___ clothing purchasing
___ laundry
___ house cleaning
___ food purchasing
___ other (specify) _____

_____

V. How do you (son/daughter) participate in the following domestic tasks now?

	___ independently	___ w/assistance	___ do not participate
-cook own snacks/meals	___	___	___
-do own laundry	___	___	___
-sew/mend clothing	___	___	___
-dust/vacuum/mop	___	___	___
-simple maintenance/repairs	___	___	___
-purchase own food	___	___	___
-purchase own clothes	___	___	___
-other (specify)_____	___	___	___
_____	___	___	___
_____	___	___	___

W. In general, since school was completed these domestic skills have:
___ continued to improve
___ stayed about the same
___ regressed
___ other (comment) _____

X. Which of these self care tasks were taught in school?
___ toileting ___ dressing ___ bathing/grooming ___ eating ___ other (explain)

_____

Y. How do you (son/daughter) participate in routine self care tasks?

	___ independently	___ with assistance
-toileting	___	___
-dressing	___	___
-bathing/grooming	___	___
-eating	___	___
-other (specify)_____	___	___
_____	___	___
_____	___	___

Z. In general, since I was completed, these self care skills have:

___ continu[illegible]prove
___ regress
___ stayed about the same
___ other (comment) _____

IV. Personality/Quality of Life

AA. Did you (sghter):

-take a minimpetency test/exit in high school? ___ yes ___ no
-pass a minimpetency? ___ yes ___ no

BB. At which oplaces do you (son/daughter) spend 1 or more hours each week?

___ shoppinties
___ homes ols
___ indoor rea activities (movies, video aetc.)
___ outdoor recreation facilities (swimming, parks, outside sports, etc.)
___ other (explain) _____

CC. Which of thivities do you (son/daughter) regularly enjoy at home?

___ watchingsion
___ listeningrds/tapes/discs
___ playing mes
___ using hoputer
___ crafts
___ playing video games
___ playing table games, puzzles
___ other (explain) _____

DD. Which of thivities do you (son/daughter) participate in regularly?

___ jogging
___ swimmin
___ other (ex_____
___ bowling
___ bicycling

EE. To which ofowing groups or clubs do you (son/daughter) belong?

___ church c
___ YWCA/Y
___ Scouts
___ exercise class
___ adult education class
___ other (explain) _____

FF. Which of thing events do you attend?

___ sporting
___ concerts
___ movies
___ fairs/carnivals/festivals
___ plays
___ other (explain) _____

GG. Do you (son/er) spend most free time with:

___ family
___ alone
___ other (spe_____
___ friends
___ out in community

HH. Is free time the family spent with:

___ nonhandi people
___ handicapple
___ spends fr[illegible]ly with family
___ both handicapped and nonhandicapped people
___ other (explain) _____

II. Did you (son/daughter) ever receive sex education?
___ at home ___ in school ___ has not received sex education

JJ. Do you (son/daughter) have close friends of the opposite sex? ___ yes ___ no
If yes, how did you meet this person? _____

KK. Are you (son/daughter) registered to vote? ___ yes ___ no

LL. Do you (son/daughter) vote? ___ yes, in all elections ___ yes, in some elections ___ no

MM. Have you (son/daughter) ever had any problem with the law (traffic ticket, etc.)?
___ yes ___ no (If yes, please explain) _____

NN. How satisfied are you with your current situation?
___ very satisfied ___ somewhat dissatisfied
___ satisfied ___ very dissatisfied

OO. Which of the following are a problem for you (son/daughter)? Check all that apply.
___ health ___ loneliness
___ behavior outbursts/emotional control ___ lack of money
___ transportation ___ lack of work skills
___ making friends ___ not enough leisure activities
___ other (comment) _____
_____

PP. When still in school, was participation in the following community services part of the school program? (check all which apply)
___ restaurants ___ retail stores ___ banks ___ post office ___ hair stylists
___ church ___ other _____

QQ. How do you (son/daughter) use the following community services now?

	independent	with assistance	use frequently	seldom	do not use
-restaurant	___	___	___	___	___
-retail stores	___	___	___	___	___
-banks	___	___	___	___	___
-post office	___	___	___	___	___
-hair stylist	___	___	___	___	___
-church	___	___	___	___	___
-other	___	___	___	___	___
_____	___	___	___	___	___

RR. Can you think of a person who, during the school years, had a strong impact (influence) on you (son/daughter)? ___ yes ___ no
If yes, was that person a: ___ teacher ___ friend ___ relative
___ school administrator ___ volunteer ___ employer ___ neighbor
___ social worker ___ other (comment) _____
_____

SS. During your (son/daughter) school years did you participate in setting your school goals in your I.E.P.? ___ yes ___ no (explain) _____
_____

TT. Do you (son/daughter) feel school prepared you adequately for adult life?
___ yes ___ no (explain) _____
_____
_____

Education Transition Center

Projects on Sale!

Analysis of Role-Shifting Patterns in Transition, by Joseph J. Pasanella and Thomas I. Justice, softcover, 47 pp.

$10.00

Building Bridges: Strategies for Parent-Professional Collaboration Training for Transition, by Marlene A. Dick, Lois Moulin, Susan Pellegrini, and Jeri Traub, softcover, 50 pp.

$10.00

Collaborative Transition Planning Systems in Los Angeles County, by Bill Whitmore, softcover, 130 pp.

$20.00

A Needs Assessment for Adults with Learning Disabilities, by the Rehabilitation Center for Brain Dysfunction, Inc., softcover, 95 pp.

$15.00

Synthesis of Individual Transition Plans: Format and Process, by Kathleen LaMar and Bill Rosenberg, softcover, 128 pp.

$20.00

Programs and Services for Transition: A Synthesis of Options (Visual Depiction), by Linda Gamble, wallchart and accompanying brochure, 51 pp.

$5.00 (includes shipping)

Model Curriculum Emphasizing Transition: Planning Guide for Students with Mild Disabilities, by Lee Anderson, shrink-wrapped, 412 pp, 9 discs (Apple IIe and IBM).

$25.00

A Curriculum Guide for Transition: An Adaptation of the Individualized Critical Skills Model for Students with Mild Disabilities, by Janet Wright, softcover, 70 pp.

$10.00

Orange County Transition Products, by Beverly Huff, Linda O'Neal, Barbara Vali, Masha Burgess, and Michele Lovenduski:

Orange County Special Needs Services Directory, 220 pp.
Transition, softcover, 50 pp.
Transition Reference Guide, softcover, 9 pp.
Vocational/Employment Preparation, brochure

$20.00

A Collaborative Transition Planning System for Rural Communities: Butte County SELPA Case Study, by Frank Terstegge, softcover, 200 pp.

$20.00

Instructional Strategies for Special Education Students in Regular Vocational Classes: A Pre-Service Handbook, by Charles Kokaska and Leonard Albright, softcover, 96 pp.

$17.50

ORDER FORM

I would like to order:* _____

Name/title: _____

Address: _____

City/State/Zip: _____

Purchase Order #: _____ Check #: _____

Available from Resources in Special Education, (RiSE)
650 University Avenue, Room 201
Sacramento, CA 95825

IMPORTANT: Enclose purchase order or check made out to UCP.RISE.
Please include $4.00 for shipping and handling ($2.00 for each additional item) plus sales tax.